NIMROD BARRI

CLAUSE-MODELS IN ANTIPHONTEAN GREEK

1977

WILHELM FINK VERLAG MÜNCHEN

ISBN 3-7705-1456-4
©1977 Wilhelm Fink Verlag München
Gesamtherstellung: fotokop wilhelm weihert KG, Darmstadt

CONTENTS

	page
0. Introductory	7
0.1 Clause models	7
0.2 Corpus	12
1. Answering One-Phrase Clause	16
2. Vocative Clause	18
3. Non-Verbal Clause	20
4. Copula Clause	29
5. "There-is" and "There-is-to" Clauses	49
5.1 "There-is" (Existence) Clause	50
5.2 "There-is-to" (Possession) Clause	58
5.3 The Two "There-is" Models	65
6. Normative Statement Clause	67
7. State-of-Things Clause	78
8. Passive Verbal Clause	81
9. Intransitive Ergative Clause	92
10. Active Verbal Clause	96
11. Clause-Models in the Second Degree	99
11.1 Passive Clause with Direct Object	100
11.2 Passive Copula Clause	101
11.3 Active Verbal Copula Clause	102
11.4 Passive Clause (and Copula Clause) with Predicative Participle	104
11.5 Passive Clause (and Copula Clause) with Infinitive Object	105
11.6 Aspect Auxiliary Copula Clause	107
11.7 Non-Verbal Passive Clause	107
11.8 Transformations	107
Bibliography	109
Index to the Examples	113
Greek Index	121
Index of Names	125
General Index	127

0.

INTRODUCTORY

0.1 Clause Models

Pre-Structural Greek grammars tend to assign clause-structure essentially to one "model". This model is usually described as consisting of a subject and a predicate, identified in turn with certain word-classes: the subject should normally be a noun or its substitutes (pronoun, articled adjective, etc.), the predicate is some kind of a verb. This is what one finds e.g. in the extensive syntax by Kühner and Gerth (1898: §350). Copula sentences are similarly treated by these authors as subject-predicate constructions containing *kopulaartige Verben* (1898: §355); in verbless ("nominal") sentences this copula is considered to have been omitted (1898: §354). Exactly the same views are to be found in Goodwin (1894: §890-2). The more modern syntax by Schwyzer introduces some sort of a division: it separates one-word sentences (call-outs, imperatives, *Impersonalia der Naturerscheinungen*, other *impersonalia*; cf. 620 and *Zusätze* 1,2,3) from other sentences, which are made up of subject and predicate. These *Mehrwortsätze* may be verbal or nominal. Nominal sentences are either copula sentences or verbless sentences, where Schwyzer sees ellipsis of the copula (1950: 622-4).

The preference given for the subject (=noun) plus predicate

(=verb or verbal group) model is, as is known, ancient[1]. It is based on the fact that a great majority of the clauses attested in Greek texts contain indeed a verb or a form that shows some outer similarity to a verb ("copula verb", "impersonal verb"). It is further supported by centuries-long relationship between linguistics and logic, whence SUBJECT and PREDICATE were finally[2] taken, and the understandable aspiration to unify the grammatical and philosophical division of the sentence and the proposition.

A further result of this state of affairs was the common formal definition of a sentence: a sentence should contain a finite verb, mostly also a noun-subject. Incidentally, this definition does not distinguish between a SENTENCE as a unit of information, formally constituted of a "skeleton" (Hockett, 1958: 164) plus an intonation-curve, and, on the other hand, a CLAUSE, which is a specific pattern (or model) of some parts of speech. Thus German to this day does not possess a term for CLAUSE: both a sentence and a clause are *Satz*. It means that a *Satz* can contain a *Hauptsatz* (primary clause) and a *Nebensatz* (subordinate clause). This takes the ground from under the definition of the sentence as a noun + verb construction, since this (complex) *Satz* is no longer made up of one subject and one predicate, but of two "partial" *Sätze*, but is still considered a *Satz*. It is as if we said that 1 *Satz* + 1 *Satz* = 1 *Satz*.

Traditional and structural English terminology fortunately avoids this *Satz* trap, by using SENTENCE *vs.* CLAUSE. In French too the distinction is observed by means of *phrase vs. proposition*. Unfortunately, Generative Grammar has reintroduced the *Satz* ambiguity, by using S as a symbol for both entities. This was not

---

1 For the development of ancient syntax and the transition of ὄνομα and ῥῆμα from syntactic functions to word-class designations see Steinthal, 1890: I, 238ff., 297ff., II, 237ff., 267ff.; Robins, 1960: 5-11. Lyon's account is very short, and therefore misleading (1968: 1.2.5, 7.6.4, 8.1.2).

2 The grammaticalization of *subject* and *predicate* took place not earlier than the end of the 17th century: Jellinek 1913-14: II, 602: Schulze, 1919: 4; Polotsky 1962: 415. Many authors fail to mention this, thus giving the impression that these are ancient grammatical terms: Bloomfield, 1933: 5; Robins, 1971: 239f.; Lyons, 1968: 1.2.5, 8.1.2; and even Steinthal, 1890.

due to chance. Generative Grammar at the same time readopted the most traditional view of sentence-structure: it has to contain a noun-phrase and a verb-phrase, exactly as Kühner-Gerth have it, or, better, exactly as the Stoics had it. Generative grammar has thus chosen to ignore information gathered in many languages where noun+ verb clauses are not the only or favourite type; it has recentered itself upon the Graeco-Latin unique clause model[3].

It is true that English, the new traffic language of the Western Hemisphere, which has inherited Latin (and French), has a favourite sentence type which is indeed the noun + verb type. Now, Generative grammar is today as English-centered as traditional grammar was Latin-centered. Only we must not forget that even in English the favourite type is not the only one. Hockett (1958: 200) enumerates some minor sentence-types: the imperative, the vocative, the aphoristic, interjections and fragments of full sentences[4]. To these he adds a few CLAUSE-TYPES: I. intransitive clause, II. transitive clause[5] and III. equational ("copula") with three subtypes, according as the predicate attribute is A. a noun, B. an adjective or C. an adverbial. Afterwards come a few kinds of passive clauses[6]. Hockett's distinction of clause-types is

---

[3] Representing a more recent trend, Fillmore's "case theory" (1968) although staying within the verbal model, has tried to abolish the obligatory binomial subject-predicate pattern (and immediate constituents!). Fillmorean clause-structure, consisting of a verb plus any number of "case" representations (out of a good many), in fact opens up the way to recognize a certain number of recurring formulae or models consisting of verb + cases.

[4] Apparently Hockett, following Bloomfield, considers these minor types different from the favourite one not in construction, but in intonation and function; otherwise he would have classified them with some types of clauses, of which he gives the list later.

[5] A complicated question is whether to assign "transitivity" to the verbal phrase or to the clause as a whole, as does Hockett. See below 10.3.

[6] Hockett says that active-passive classification cuts across clause-types. But as models of clause-structure they nevertheless constitute different patterns, a fact which increases the overall number of clause-models in English. In addition, "intransitive passive" and "transitive passive" both match "transitive active", since the author had not distinguished between clauses with direct object and those with both direct and indirect ones, which

essentially the same as Fries's FRAMES (1952: 76ff.). Lyons too has some vague mention of "types of sentences" (1968: 352). A more rigorous result is Harris's formulae, where no a-priori number of clause types is established:

> "The final result, for each language which can be analyzed in this manner, takes the form of one or more sequences of substitution classes ('utterance construction', 'sentence types')... The final formulae therefore give us the limitation upon the freedom of occurrence of morphemes in the language,..." (1946: 6.3).

All these formulations of discovering clause-types may be resumed in Hockett's words: "If we lift the intonation from sentences, the segmental remainders are highly diverse, but in any one language there are limitations" (1958: 199)[7]. These limitations are the types or MODELS on which clauses are built.

Thus, even in English, language of the "favourite type", there must be more than one clause-model. To the models mentioned above we may add "existence" clauses as *There is a book there*; "impersonals" as *It seems to me*... and others. These are naturally described somehow by English grammars, but as a rule they are condensed within the frame of the "normal" noun+verb type, even when noting their special character: Jespersen, 1909-1949: II 6.81f. notes the "emptiness" of *there is*, its obligatory position in sentence-beginning, and says that it "becomes a fixed formula to indicate the existence of something". Fries, 1952: 97 has *there* for a "function word" (the only one in its group: H.).

In the investigation of "exotic" languages linguists, even though influenced strongly by Graeco-Roman tradition, have long been forced to speak of clause (or sentence) types. Semitic languages, as well as Coptic, Melanesian and Amerindian languages have all seen the establishment of at least a distinction between "nominal" and "verbal" clause-models, often many more than these. Sometimes these results have been incorporated into the study of

---

would increase even more the list of clause-types.

[7] The neglecting of intonation, inevitable when using written examples, seems to be the major factor behing the postulation of the NP + VP type for every sentence, with both traditionalists and generativists.

Greek or other Indo-European languages (cf. Benveniste, 1950, Hjelmslev, 1948 and literature cited by them).

In what follows I shall make a clear distinction between (1) The sentence, which from the point of view of the *signifié* is a unit of binomial information, saying (predicating) some thing (the New) about something else (the Given). These parts are not necessarily identified with noun, verb, or other parts of speech. Considered as a *signifiant*, the sentence is defined by an intonation curve (cf. Benveniste, 1950: 22; Hockett 1958: 199ff.; presumably also in Ancient Greek, in whose texts we have at most some punctuation marks to mark end of curves). A single intonation curve may cover a number of clauses at a time, making of them one sentence. (2) The clauses, or clause-models, which are formulae describable each by a fixed number of parts or "positions". Within each such part there is commutation (substitution) among certain forms. Some of these forms are "words", some are not. Again, some can be conveniently labelled as conventional "parts of speech", others cannot. "Positions" are not to be taken in the sense of places in a certain word order, just "boxes" for commutation.

Naturally some models contain parts which figure also in other models. What is different is the "formula" built of a different set of parts. Noun phrases, for example, figure in most models. Even clearer is the case of verbs like καθέστηκα which may figure in the active verbal model, meaning "stand", but may also appear in the copula model, with a "weaker" meaning due to the model. Some parts superficially resemble other models' parts, but on structural examination turn out to constitute independent entities. This is the case of "impersonals" like εἰκός or δεῖ which might be labelled "participle" and "verb" respectively, but which in our sixth model belong to the same model-part (cf. §6 below). Because of these partial resemblances, it has not been easy to decide on the number of models needed for the description of the text in question (see below). What decided were reasons of the simplest arrangement, based on the double criterion of form and meaning.

It is often difficult to decide on the appurtenance of a clause to such or such a model, or even to a model-part. For example, one should decide whether a group like Antiphon 1.8 ἀντομωμοκὼς ἔσται

belongs to the copula model (§4) or to the verb part in the active verbal model (§10).

Some clauses constitute a neutralization of an opposition between two models. A frequent case of this kind is when the clause is elliptic. Often it is difficult to complete the omitted part, so that the remainder is hard to classify.

A word has to be said about participial and infinitive groups. These are hard to classify as either phrases or clauses: they have the function of the former, but contain structures of the latter. Some scholars would be tempted to resolve the problem by saying they are TRANSFORMATIONS of finite clauses. This may be true in some technical sense, but does not answer the question, whether they are to be treated with finite clauses or not. We prefer the structuralist view, according to which the *accusativus cum infinitivo* is an ALLOTAGM of the finite clause, required by the indirect speech construction. Being a variant, it has to be treated together with the other variant, namely the finite clause. This is true for all other infinitival or participial "phrases". We have therefore included among our examples such phrases. Needless to say, not all clause-models show such variants. For example, the non-verbal clause is not susceptible of an infinitive or a participle, because it has no verbal form (See also models 1 and 2).

0.2 Corpus

Until about 20 years ago, the choice of a given homogeneous corpus for linguistic analysis used to be considered a great achievement of modern, structural linguistics. The practice is traceable in equal manner to Saussure's distinction of synchronic vs. diachronic linguistics, as well as to practical considerations brought forth by dialectologists, mainly in the investigation of Amerindian languages. It may be formulated shortly as describing no more than what is contained in a corpus.

Since 1957, the Chomskyan approach has tried to abolish corpus-analysis, contending primarily that no corpus is completely

representative of the language, so that if one abstains from any data from outside the corpus his "rules" will not be good enough for the language as a whole. This view rests on a serious misunderstanding of linguistic situations in general: it takes the borders between p o l i t i c a l units to correspond to linguistic borders: We have either English or French, German, etc. Now every linguist with some experience knows that these names, English, French etc., are nothing but designations of regularized civilization-languages, which cannot possibly "represent" the whole variety of dialects or social idioms (cf. Martinet, 1962: 113ff.; 1967: 5.1ff.). Thus a really homogeneous corpus, consisting of the language of one single idiolect, has no such task as representing a language, for "a language" in this sense is a social or political entity, not a linguistic one[8].

Chomsky's objection, as we saw, concerned the requirement to account for no more than the data within a corpus. But this is only one side of corpus analysis. The other one is that a description should cover ALL the data within that corpus: it has to be EXHAUSTIVE. Only thus can we be sure we have captured the whole system of the language in the corpus in question.

Unfortunately, Greek, a language of many dialects, with a history longer than most known languages, has traditionally been handled as if it were monolithic. Here and there a dissertation or a monograph are dedicated to one *état de langue*, but "serious" grammars cover no less than 500 years, including all dialects. In my mind, it is high time to seriously start breaking this habit.

This article will try to be loyal to the two corpus-principles stated above:

a) I shall enumerate the caluse-models attested in one small corpus of 5th century Attic Greek, describing them by means of the above mentioned parts. Our corpus will be two speeches (the first and the fifth) out of six by the rhetor Antiphon. This writer has been chosen on account of his place in Attic prose: he may well be

---

[8] Generative Grammar, in spite of some protestation from within its adherents, is well on the way to a description of all periods and all dialects as one, abolishing synchronic research. Cf.among others, Newton, 1972.

considered the first Athenian prose-writer. The two speeches constitute some 3/7 of the entire text. Because of the requirement of exhaustion, every single clause in the text was analysed. This time-consuming procedure forced me to restrict my corpus to a portion of the Antiphontean text we possess. Experience shows that for the detection of most models a page or two suffice, so that the two speeches may well represent the rest. Still, it is quite possible that the remaining material would have supplied evidence for some additional model. Therefore the present monograph, in accordance with corpus analysis in general, does not claim to reflect the structure of clauses located outside the chosen pieces, either in the text of Antiphon or in Greek in general. In citing we shall follow the accepted textual division by H. Estienne, contained e.g. in Blass-Thalheim (1914) and Gernet (1923): the speech about the poisoning by the step-mother will be numbered 1, that about the murder of Herodes, 5. Every example will be cited by speech, paragraph and line of paragraph. Relevant words will be underlined, if necessary, to distinguish them from the rest of the example.

b) Every statement will represent exhaustively all relevant data in the corpus, unless otherwise stated. Where examples are few, they will be enumerated in full. In other cases we shall use *etc.* to refer to the data investigated but not cited.

For each clause-model we shall indicate[9]:

1. Its PARTS: each such part will usually have the form of a commutation paradigm, whose members will be designated by common part-of-speech terms, where such are available. (We shall assume, for the purpose of the present article, that these terms are sufficiently defined; their definition cannot be undertaken here.) Each part, naturally, may be accompanied by the expansions compatible with the part of speech in question. For example, a noun

---

[9] In the kinds of information given for each model I have followed mainly Rosen 1967a: 197-302, which constitutes the most complete and systematic account of clause models as such, that I know of. Rosén has moreover developed a numerical notation of grammatical categories contained in each model-part which is ingeniously simple and useful. Such a system will unfortunately outscope the present paper, which does not go into the description of model-parts. See also Dotan, 1971 and Rosén, 1975.

may be expanded by adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, etc. But the article will not be considered as expansion, for it has been found to be obligatory or excluded in some parts. Further, the relevance of syntactic categories like SUBJECT, OBJECT etc. will be discussed for each model.

2. The DEPENDENCES obtaining between the parts.

3. Possible OMISSION of parts. Many actual clauses present an incomplete model, but context permits in most cases satisfactory identification of the model. Where this is not possible, we may speak of an extreme case of neutralization between two or more models, brought about by omission.

4. Eventual NEGATION of the clause. (As a matter of fact, every model having a negative counterpart forms with it a binary paradigm within the model, thus increasing by one the number of models.)

5. Another eventual paradigm is that of assertion : interrogation : exclamation, which we shall call PRESENTATION TYPE. We shall specify for each model whether all members of this paradigm are attested or not.

6. WORD-ORDER. This seems to have almost no relevance to the models (unlike English where it is an essential factor in "clause-formulas"). That is why establishing models cannot be done by distributional methods. We shall reflect this by the examples given for each model.

It would perhaps be well to note that irrelevance for model-construction does not mean that word order in Greek (or Antiphon) is "free" (a label which actually has no sense at all). It obviously fulfills other functions, mainly that of showing "psychological predication", sometimes called by Czech and Russian scholars "Actual Sentence bipartition" (Daneš, 1967: 222; Dahl, 1969: 7), "thematization" in Halliday's terms (1967-68), who also uses *Given* and *New* for the two parts the bipartition yields. We shall use these in our discussion.

ANSWERING ONE-PHRASE CLAUSE

5.63.3 (πότερα... ἐκπρίασθαι;) οὐ δῆτα· (τῷ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν χρήματα, ...) "(Is it... to buy?) By no means. (He had no money,...)".

This is the only true example of a model whose parallels in other languages are frequent[10] (cf. e.g. Modern Greek ὄχι "no" and ναί "yes"). Ancient Greek has some fuller forms of affirmation and negation (cf. Schwyzer, 1950: 631); still, other texts show examples of ναί and οὐ together with a rich choice of interjections and onomatopoeias ("*Ursprünglische, echte Einwortsätze*" in Schwyzer, 1950: 620,a)). In Antiphon, not only in our corpus, but also in the rest of the text, there are no other examples. (but cf. ὦ q.v. below §2.)

The reason seems to lie in the juristic character of our text, which is meant to make fluent, rhetorically acceptable speeches. We should note however, that this finding represents no technical shortcoming of the corpus: not having such models is an essential part of its language, which we set out to describe.

---

[10] Harris, 1946: 4.1 (end) throws together sentence adverbs as *now*, *then*, *thus*, with clauses like *Yes*, *No*, *Hello*, *Oh*. De Groot (1949: ch. 7) has rightly seen these as "sentence unit". The same view in Tesnière (1959: 94), who cites as examples *Oui*, *Non*, *Parbleu!*

We do find "secondary one-word clauses" (Schwyzer, 1950: 620,b), i.e. parts of elliptic clauses. The full clause model behind such a phrase or word is not always easy to supply, but they are nonetheless parts of a longer model. See for example: (from outside our proper corpus) 6.15.5 οὐ δῆτα ἔγωγε <sc. τοῦτου ἕνεκα λέγω> cf. Cleef s.v. οὐ, A1g). "Not I!".
1.13.5 Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑμεῖς γε <sc. βουλήσεσθε>, (ὦ ἄνδρες, ἔγωγ' εὖ οἶδα, ἀλλὰ σαφὲς ποιήσετε). "But not you, (oh judges, as I know for sure; you will bring it into the light)".
See also 5.86.1 Μὴ ὑμεῖς γε, (ὦ ἄνδρες, ἀλλὰ δότε τι...). "Don't you (do it), (oh judges, but leave something...).

These examples do not differ from other incomplete expressions, e.g. 5.10.2 ὁμολογῶ μέγιστόν γε (sc. κακούργημα εἶναι, to be supplied from the preceding context)[11].

---

[11] As for *impersonalia*, both of the δεῖ type and "atmospherical", which Schwyzer counts among *Einwortsätze* (1950: 621, 3 and *Zusatz* 2, 622 *Zus*. 3), see below 6.

VOCATIVE CLAUSE

ὦ + noun in the vocative.

1.3.1 Δέομαι δ' ὑμῶν, <u>ὦ ἄνδρες</u>, ἐὰν ἐπιδείξω... τιμωρῆσαι... τοῖς νόμοις... "And I ask of you, gentlemen, if I prove... to help... the laws..."

2.1 All examples have a noun in the plural; their case therefore does not differ from the nominative. What makes us call it VOCATIVE is the fact that such nouns are never definite. Such a behaviour of the vocative concerning definiteness is known from other languages, leaving this case isolated from all others. In fact, the vocative has very little in common with other cases: its occurence is limited to a single environment, which is precisely the present model. This brings us to the thought that articled nouns and unarticled ones do not commute freely, at least in some environments, which may indicate that the definite and the indefinite do not form a paradigm at all (Barri, 1975: §3).

No dependences, omissions or negation are possible in this model. The model is exclamative by nature, but can be integrated (see below) within both assertions and questions. Word-order is always as given above.

This model is very unvariedly attested: 19 times ὦ ἄνδρες (cf. Cleef, 1895: s.v. ὦ), once ὦ δικάζοντες (1.7.6, transposed by some

editors to 1.6.3) and once ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί (5.84.1). All examples are contained as a parenthesis (separated by commas in modern editions) within another clause, mostly immediately after its first phrase[12]. This position is in accord with the function of this kind of clause: it is to call for attention by transmitting some of the speaker's emotion, genuine or affected. The attention is consequently drawn, at least in part, to the remainder of the sentence, where the actual information is contained (cf. Bally, 1944: §60).

Schwyzer calls both the vocative word and the interjection ὦ *echte Einwortsätze* and adds: "oft gelten diese Elemente als Bestandteite eines normalen Satzes; aber ihre (ursprüngliche) selbständige Satzgeltung zeigt sich noch in ihrer freien Stellung" (1950: 620, a). Schwyzer (1950: 601 Fussn. 3) further thinks this position has given the interjection its name (*inter-iectio*).

In our corpus we never find a vocative noun without ὦ, nor vice versa. What we have then is not "one word clause" but one-phrase clause, where ὦ and the vocative stand in a sort of presupposition to one another.

---

[12] In this the vocative clause is very much like English *Sir*, inserted as a rule after the first phrase of a clause.

NON-VERBAL CLAUSE

I		II
Definite Part		*Mixed Part*
articled noun personal pronoun relative pronoun articled participle articled infinitive	nominative[13]	noun οὗτος adjective participle
ὅτι + clause		prepositional phrase

3.1 Parts

An essential feature of the model seems that at least one of the parts must be definite, either by the definite article or by the "built in" definiteness of personal and relative pronouns[14]. Ὅτι +

---

[13] In non-finite clauses other cases may be found, but always the same case in both part I and part II.

[14] Definiteness of relative pronouns has been discussed in many languages. This seems almost self evident, as relatives are anaphoric, perhaps the only pronouns which are always so. It is however desirable to prove this further. One such proof may be just the commutation with definites shown above. For a revealing proof of the same situation in Albanian, cf. Morgan, 1972: 67f.

clause is considered here definite by its commutation with definite expressions.

The expressions under II are indefinite, except αὕτη in 5.21.1 Ἡ μὲν πρόφασις... αὕτη· "This is the reason, then". In this case we can analyse either part as Definite or Mixed.

In principle, every Definite Part may be combined with every Mixed Part. The 19 sure examples are thus distributed:

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
	II Mixed Part / I Def. Part	noun	οὗτος	adject.	partic.	prep. phrase
a	art. noun		5.21.1		1.19.5 5.7.4	5.7.5 5.32.1 5.88.5
b	pers. pronoun	5.94.3		1.1.1, 1.4.1 5.43.2 5.79.10 5.79.11 5.85.7	1.27.6	1.13.7
c	relat. pronoun			1.21.5		
d	art. participle	5.94.7				
e	art. infinitive	5.91.8 5.94.5				
f	ὅτι + clause			1.13.1 5.26.6 5.28.2 5.35.1		

According to the table, clauses with a personal pronoun and an adjective are best represented. In fact, this may be inexact: 1.4.1 ἀναγκαῖοι "relatives", 5.43.2 κακοδαίμων "miserable", 5.79.10 γέρων "old, old man" may be regarded either as adjectives (which we did) or as nouns. What lies behind this situation is this: in the present model, an indefinite gender-bearing noun is hardly distinguishable from an adjective, for they have exactly the same

commutation-paradigm, hence the same function. The above are gender bearing nominals of the type βασιλεύς "king": βασίλεια "queen". It is their indefiniteness which makes them be felt as adjectives. The conclusion might here be that in some model-parts, certain "parts-of-speech" are no longer in opposition; any attempt to identify them is based on distinctions imported from other environments.

Examples for all intersections of the distribution table above:

a1: See above.

a4: 5.7.4 Ἡ μὲν οὖν αἴτησις, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ νομίμως καὶ ὁσίως ἔχουσα, καὶ... "The request, then, gentlemen, is both legitimate and hallowed, and..."

a5: 5.88.5 (αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα,) περὶ ὧν οἱ κίνδυνοι, "(those very matters,) concerning which is the danger,".

b1: 5.94.3 Τούτων γὰρ ἔργον τοῦτο, "It is their business,".

b3: 1.4.1 ὑμεῖς γάρ μοι ἀναγκαῖοι. "For it is you who are my relatives".

b4: 1.27.6 (καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνον αὕτη... ἀπώλεσεν, οὕτω) καὶ αὐτὴ ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἀπολομένη, καὶ... "(And exactly as she... killed him, so) she too will perish by you and by justice, and..."

b5: 1.13.7 Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου. "This is up to now, then".

c3: 1.21.5 (Οὗτος δὲ τοῦ μὲν τεθνεῶτος πέρι οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς αἰτήσεται,) ὃς ἄξιος (καὶ ἐλέου καὶ βοηθείας καὶ τιμωρίας παρ' ὑμῶν τυχεῖν,...) "(But he will request nothing from you on account of the victim,) who is worthy (of finding pity and help and vengeance with you,...)".

d1: 5.94.7 Οὔτε χρόνος πολὺς ὁ διαφέρων, "Nor is the separating interval a long time,".

e1: 5.91.8 (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνηκέστοις) πλέον βλάβος τὸ μετανοεῖν... "(In irreparable matters) regretting is worse damage..."

f3: 5.28.2 δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λιμένος ἦν τὸ πλοῖον. "It is clear that the boat was from the same port."

3.2 Dependences

3.2.1 There is a dependence of CASE between nouns, adjectives, participles, pronouns and infinitives occurring in the Definite part and those in the Mixed part: they are both in the nominative. Syntactically, if not morphologically, it may be said that the whole prepositional phrase is in the nominative, since it commutes only with nominatives. A clear example of the equivalence of a participle in the nominative and a prepositional phrase is the following: 5.7.4-5 Ἡ μὲν οὖν αἴτησις, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ νομίμως καὶ ὁσίως ἔχουσα, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ δικαίῳ οὐχ ἧσσον ἢ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ. "The request, men of the jury, is both legitimate and hallowed, and according to your justice no less than to mine."

3.2.2 There is a dependence of GENDER and NUMBER between gender-inflecting forms in the Mixed part (adjectives, participles, third person personal pronouns) and the forms in the Definite part.

First and second personal pronouns have no gender; they contract only number dependence. Any "gender concord" between such a Definite-part pronoun and a Mixed-part form is no dependence: here the gender-inflected form gives relevant information about the sex of the person referred to by the pronoun: 1.4.1 ὑμεῖς... ἀναγκαῖοι. 5.79.11 νεώτερος... ἐγώ..., etc.

3.3 Negation

Negation is by οὐ: 5.43.2 οὐ... οὕτω κακοδαίμων ἐγώ. Cf. also 5.85.7, 5.94.7.

3.4 Omissions

Omission of either part was found only when the omitting clause continues a full clause of the present model: 5.7.4-5 Ἡ... αἴτησις ... ὁσίως ἔχουσα, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ δικαίῳ οὐχ ἧσσον ἢ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ (sc. ἡ αἴτησις). 5.85.7 οὐκ ἐγὼ αἴτιος, ἀλλ' οἱ κατήγοροι (sc.

αἴτιοι). Cf. also 5.94.3. For a possible omission of the copula in some of our examples continuing a copula clause (which results in a non-verbal clause) see 4.4.3.

3.5 Presentation Type

No interrogative clause was found in the present model (neither word-interrogative nor clause interrogative).

The distinction between assertion and exclamation is not very clear in this model. Actually most of the examples seem to contain some exclamatory force, perhaps because of the pathos-imbibed tone of the speeches. This is felt more clearly where we have first or second person pronouns:
1.1.1 Νέος μὲν καὶ ἄπειρος δικῶν ἔγωγε ἔτι... 1.4.1 ὑμεῖς γάρ μοι ἀναγκαῖοι. 5.43.2 οὐ γάρ δήπου οὕτω κακοδαίμων ἐγώ, ὥστε... Cf. also 5.79.10-11 (bis), 5.85.7, 5.94.3. Nevertheless, there are exclamation-type clauses with third person too: 1.13.7 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου 5.21.1 ἡ πρόφασις... αὕτη. Cf. 5.91.8-9, 5.94.7.

3.6 Word Order

3.6.1 Instances of conditioned order (consequently irrelevant to our discussion here)are those with a relative pronoun, which stands always at the beginning (1.21.5, 5.7.5, 5.32.1-2, 5.88.5).

3.6.2 When unconditioned by other factors, word order is mostly determined by parts of speech. Yet certain Given-New partitions of the clause may change normal order. In normal order, nouns (articled or not) seem to favour clause-beginning; so do personal pronouns. When a noun and a personal pronoun combine in a clause, the noun precedes.

Preceding	*Following*
articled noun	participle prepositional phrase οὗτος (once: 5.21.1)
noun	articled infinitive articled participle pronoun (once: 5.94.3)
pronoun	participle prepositional phrase

For examples see above §3.

In only one combination do pronouns favour clause-end:

adjective personal pronoun

This order is reversed under one circumstance. When the pronoun is the polemic New of the clause (cf. below 3.7.1): 1.4.1 ΥΜΕΙΣ γάρ μοι ἀναγκαῖοι "For it is you who are my relatives". See also 5.85.7.

3.7 Discussion

3.7.1 Given-New

We may ask whether there is any typical role attached to the Definite part as against the other. Indeed, such typical roles are demonstrable. The Definite part seems, in the majority of the examples, to be the Given, whereas the Mixed part is the New (cf. Gildersleeve, 1903: 7-8).

No wonder the definite tends to be Given: its definiteness means it has been already mentioned or that it is somehow known. But the one example with both parts definite (5.21.1, cited above §3) shows this is not absolute. In fact, only the context (and, orally, the stress?) can show us what is Given, what is New.

Such contextual evidence makes us analyse 3 (out of 19) examples as having the indefinite part for Given. In two instances the New is accompanied by an emphasizing negation or "also", so that it forms an extra strong, POLEMIC New (in capitals in the examples),

often translatable by an English cleft sentence. This kind of sentence bipartition consists precisely in giving the prominence of the New to the better known part, in this case the Definite:
1.4.1 ΥΜΕΙΣ γάρ μοι ἀναγκαῖοι. "It is YOU who are my relatives."
1.27.6 (καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνον αὕτη... ἀπώλεσεν,) οὕτω ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΗ ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἀπολομένη. "(And in the same way that she killed him,) so SHE TOO will be killed by you and by justice."
5.85.7 ΟΥΚ ΕΓΩ αἴτιος, ἀλλ' οἱ κατήγοροι. "It is NOT I who is responsible, but the accusers."

It is important to note that the clause partition just established has nothing to do with GRAMMATICAL SUBJECT and PREDICATE. There is no possible use for the grammatical terms in the present model. (As we shall see, they might be used in other models, even if they may still cause confusion.) What is left then is: I. Definite part, mostly Given. II. Mixed part, mostly New.

3.7.2.

What is the function of the non-verbal model? The question has been posed a few times in the discussion of the "nominal sentence" (references, mainly for Greek, in Schwyzer 1950: 623, Fn. 1).

The best known essay is perhaps that by Benveniste (1950) who, choosing his examples from Greek of three periods (Homer, Pindar, Herodotus) states two characteristics of the *phrase nominale*: "I. elle est toujours liée au discours direct; II. elle sert toujours à des assertions de caractère général, voire sentencieux." (1950: 30). The second statement, as Benveniste notes, appears already in Meillet (1906-08: 16). It is also to be found in Kühner-Gerth (1897: §354,a) but only as one possibility. A similar view in Schwyzer 1949: 623. Aided by proverbial models conserved in modern European languages (*Ehestand*, *Wehestand* etc.), this view seems to be current.

Of Benveniste's three texts only two, Homer and Pindar, seem to corroborate his conclusions. Herodotus III,82 δηλοῖ... ὡς... is not a direct speech, nor are III,29 and III,140 general truths (the first is concerned with the fitness of a certain God for the Egyptians; the second compares the beauty of a certain donation with another; both are specific matters).

It seems therefore that Benveniste's statements are too general to cover all cases. This is all the more natural in conclusions based on heterogeneous sources. In our own corpus, we note:
I. As for the occurrence in direct discourse, our examples seem to corroborate this almost without exception (but then Antiphon's speeches are practically wholly direct speech).
II. It is by no means exact that the model always expresses general truths; for example 1.13.7 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου "That is all up to now". 5.21.1 Ἡ μὲν πρόφασις ἑκατέρῳ τοῦ πλοῦ αὕτη. "The reason for the sea-trip for each of the two is (was) this:" Cf. also 5.79.10; 5.94.3,7 and immediately below.

A matter to be connected with the general-truth question is the category of person in the verbless model. Benveniste cites (1950: 19) Meillet as stating that the "nominal sentence" is at the 3rd person; Benveniste's examples all agree with that, but he himself nowhere states this as a characteristic of the Indo-European (or Greek) model. Kühner and Gerth (1898: §354) say that the copula is left out "meistens nur im Indik. Praes... vorwiegend in der 3. Person" which leaves open the possibility of other persons (and moods; see also Schwyzer 1950: 623). On the other hand Hjelmslev, studying mainly Latin, states expressly: "il s'agit d'un syncrétisme soluble des trois personnes" (1948: 175; *soluble* means here that the context may show that a *phrase nominale* REFERS to a certain person).

Now our texts offer some clear examples of first and second persons, as e.g. the first clause of the first speech:
1.1.1 Νέος μὲν καὶ ἄπειρος δικῶν ἔγωγε ἔτι, "I am young and inexperienced of trials still,". See also 1.4.1; 5.43.2; 5.79.11; 5.85.7.

These examples, precisely because of the "interlocutive" persons involved, cannot be general truths; they are too personal. We saw above that the same is true for third person pronouns as 5.21.1 αὕτη 5.94.3 τοῦτο 1.13.7 ταῦτα. General assertions therefore are not a characteristic of the model, even if they may be thereby expressed.

We should perhaps proceed from Benveniste's first conclusion: appearance of the model in direct speech, which has been found true

for our own examples. This trait, therefore, even if it permits exceptions, merits to be looked into. A reconsideration of all the examples which bears this in mind indeed reveals something: all clauses seem to have the quality of quick, impatient assertions, most of them on the verge of exclamations.

It would be almost too simple to say those verbless clauses were emitted when there was no time or patience for verbs, just for the essential New and its Given. Besides, in Antiphon's well-calculated speeches the writer was probably in no want of time. Still, if he wanted to transmit the feeling of urgency, the use of verbless clauses may have been a calculated means for it. Incidentally, the conlcusion that the non-verbal model is exclamative or at least impatient, does not fit Hjelmslev's suggestion that in Latin *omnia praeclara sunt rara* is more emphatic than *omnia praeclara rara*, just as *ego sum* is more emphatic than *sum* alone. But then "emphasis" is a rather ambiguous term.

COPULA CLAUSE

I. *Subject*		II. *Predicative*	III. *Copula*
articled noun	nominative[15]	noun	ἀναφαίνομαι
articled adjective or participle		adjective	ἀπολείπομαι
articled infinitive		articled participle	γίγνομαι
personal pronoun		ταῦτα	εἰμί
relative pronoun		οἵτινες	ἐνδείκνυμαι
τις		genitive noun or participle	καθέστηκα, κατέστην
πολλοί		prepositional phrase	καλέομαι
εἰ + clause		ἔνδον	ὑπάρχω
ὅτε + clause			φαίνομαι
			ψηφίζομαι

In principle, every subject may be combined with every predicative. Actual cooccurrences are these:

---

[15] See note 13.

4.0.1 Distribution of parts I, II.

I Subject \ II Predicative	1. noun	2. adjective	3. articled participle	4. ταῦτα	5. οἵτινες	6. genitive noun or participle	7. preposit. phrase	8. ἔνδον
a. articled noun	1.3.1 5.5.7 5.5.8 5.8.7 5.35.2-3 5.87.2 5.88.6-7	1.5.2 1.6.8[16]				5.1.2 5.92.2-3 5.94.9-10	1.8.3 1.29.3[17]	
b. articled adjective or participle	5.50.8-9 5.88.7-8	1.13.3 1.20.6 5.11.6 5.25.5-6(bis) 5.43.1 5.63.1 5.68.4 5.70.6 5.73.4-5 5.79.9		5.25.1	5.68.3	5.51.5-6	5.32.2-3	

c. articled infinitive	5.10.1	5.91.2 5.94.1-2						
d. personal pronoun	1.4.3 1.5.3[18]	1.2.6(bis) 1.3.9[19]	1.11.6 5.30.4-5 5.90.6				1.17.1 1.19.7[20]	5.69.5
e. relative pronoun	5.14.5 5.54.2 5.83.5	1.2.4(bis) 1.4.1-2 5.13.7 5.62.5 5.81.1-2 5.84.8-7					5.62.5 5.88.3	
f. τις		5.3.6 5.45.7						5.45.8
g. πολλοί		5.3.2 5.3.4 5.82.8-9						
h. εἰ + clause		1.12.5-6 5.92.4						
i. ὅτε + clause		5.36.6-7						

---

[16] Other articled noun -- adjective examples: 1.13.3, 1.20.7, 5.12.8, 5.21.7-8, 5.22.7, 5.23.5, 5.25.3, 5.35.6, 5.37.3, 5.37.7, 5.46.2-3, 5.47.3, 5.52.1, 5.54.5, 5.57.5, 5.61.8, 5.64.3-4, 5.64.6-7, 5.65.2-3, 5.66.5-6, 5.69.11, 5.77.5-6, 5.79.2, 5.79.4, 5.79.6, 5.80.7, 5.84.6-7.

[17] Other articled noun -- prepositional phrase examples: 5.28.3, 5.32.4, 5.37.10, 5.51.7, 5.66.2-3, 5.79.8, 5.86.4, 5.89.4.

[18] Other personal pronoun -- noun examples: 1.10.7, 1.11.6, 1.12.3, 1.12.7, 1.15.7, 5.9.4, 5.15.3, 5.15.5-6, 5.32.8, 5.38.7-8, 5.38.10, 5.47.9, 5.63.9, 5.74.3, 5.78.2-3, 5.87.4.

[19] Other personal pronoun -- adjective examples: 1.4.2, 1.4.4, 1.10.9, 1.11.9, 1.15.5, 1.16.4, 1.21.2, 1.22.5, 1.24.5-6, 1.25.4, 5.1.4, 5.9.1, 5.9.3, 5.13.6-7, 5.17.7-8, 5.18.1-2, 5.23.6-7, 5.23.8, 5.24.3, 5.49.9 (adj. εἰκότα), 5.51.4-5, 5.54.4, 5.62.8, 5.63.2, 5.63.6-7, 5.64.1, 5.66.4-5, 5.71.4, 5.71.6, 5.73.1-2, 5.75.2, 5.76.6-7, 5.80.6, 5.85.5, 5.87.7, 5.93.7-8, 5.94.11.

[20] Other personal pronoun -- prepositional phrase examples: 1.29.2, 5.22.8, 5.45.5-6, 5.45.6, 5.46.8, 5.51.5, 5.64.5-6.

The table shows that the most frequent subject is a personal pronoun (including οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος as third person pronouns). The second is the articled noun. The most frequent predicative is the adjective, but here it must be noted that, the division into parts of speech being far from perfect, I have classified as adjectives many forms which can also be considered as nouns: τιμωρός, βοηθός, ἀντίδικος, ἔνοχος, ἄπαρνος, ἔξαρνος, σύμπλους, αὐτόχειρ. "Pronominal adjectives" were also included here: 5.52.1 τοιαύτη 5.65.1 τοσοῦτον. Εἰκός (5.45.9), τὸ εἰκός (5.43.1) were also considered adjectives, not participles, since their connection with the verb is no longer felt. See theoretical implications of all this above, §3.

4.0.2 Examples for all intersections of the above table:

a1: 5.5.7 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ῥῆμα (I) τῆς γλώσσης ἁμάρτημά (II) ἐστι (III), "For the word is a failure of the tongue,".

a2: 5.57.5 δεῖ μεγάλην (II) τὴν ἔχθραν (I) ὑπάρχειν (III)... "It must be that hate is strong...".

5.37.3 οἱ ὕστεροι λόγοι (I) ἀληθέστεροι (II) φαίνονται (III). "The latter version seems truer."

a6: 5.92.2-3 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀκούσιον ἁμάρτημα (I), ὦ ἄνδρες, τῆς τύχης (II) ἐστί, "For the involuntary mistake is fate-destined,".

a7: 5.28.3 ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λιμένος (II) ἦν (III) τὸ πλοῖον (I). "The boat was from the same port."

b1: 5.88.7-8 φονέα (II) δὲ τὸν μὴ αἴτιον (I) ψηφισθῆναι (III)... "that the not-guilty be judged murderer..."

b2: 1.13.3 ᾔδεσαν γὰρ οἰκεῖον (II) σφίσι τὸ κακὸν (I) ἀναφανησόμενον (III), "For they knew the misdeed will appear their own,".

b3: 5.25.1 Τὰ μὲν γενόμενα (I) ταῦτ' (II) ἐστίν (III). "What happened is this:".

b5: 5.68.3 εἰκάζειν οἵτινες (II) ἦσαν (III) οἱ ἀποκτείναντες (I). "to guess who were the killers."

b6: 5.51.5-6 τὰ ἐξ ἴσου γενόμενα (I) τοῦ φεύγοντός (II) ἐστι (III) "Equal things are to the advantage of the defendant".

b7: 5.32.2-3 πρὸς τούτων (II) εἰσὶν (III) οἱ βασανιζόμενοι (I) "The tortured are in the power of these men".

c1: 5.10.1 τό γε ἀποκτείνειν (I) μέγα κακούργημα (II) εἶναι (III), "That killing is great sin,".

c2: 5.91.2 τὸ ἀδίκως ἀπολῦσαι (I) ὁσιώτερον (II) ἂν εἴη (III) "acquitting unfairly would be more hallowed".

d1: 1.23.7 δικασταὶ (II) ἐγένεσ-θε (III,I) καὶ ἐκλήθη-τε (III,I).

"You are yourselves constituted and called judges" (Maidment 1953: 27).

d2: 1.2.6 οὗτοι καθεστᾶσιν ἀντίδικοι "they stand adversaries".

d3: 5.90.6 ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς (I) ἔσεσθε (III) οἱ κἀκεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ διαψηφιζόμενοι (II) It will be you who will judge me there too".

d7: 5.22.8 τοῦ δὲ ὑετοῦ ἕνεκα (II) ταῦτ' (I) ἦν (III). "It was because of the rain."

d8: 5.69.5 οἱ ἔνδον (II) ὄντες (III,I). "those who are within."

e1: 5.14.5 ὅπερ (I) μέγιστόν (II) ἐστι (III) σημεῖον (II) "which is a very good sign".

e2: 5.13.7 ὃ (I) τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησι κοινόν (II) ἐστιν (III), "what is the part of every Greek,".

e7: 5.62.5 ἅπερ (I) μέγιστα (II) καὶ περὶ πλείστου (II) ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις "what is best and most precious to every man".

f2: 5.3.6 ὅταν τις (I) ἄπειρος (II) ᾖ (III) "when one is inexperienced".

f8: 5.45.8 ἔνδον ὢν αὐτοῦ "being self-contained".

g2: 5.82.8-9 πολλοὶ δὴ καταφανεῖς ἐγένοντο "many people were discovered".

h2: 5.92.4 ἑκούσιον (II) δὲ πῶς ἂν εἴη (III) μᾶλλον ἢ εἴ τις... (I) "How can it be more intentional than if someone..."

i2: 5.36.6-7 καὶ πότερ' ἀληθῆ (II) ἐστιν (III), ὅτ' ἔφη...(I) "and whether it is true, when he said...".

4.0.3 The different copula-verbs are thus attested:

ἀναφαίνομαι: 1.13.3.

ἀπολείπομαι: 1.3.9.

γίγνομαι: 1.2.4, 1.4.3, 1.10.7, 1.11.6, 1.12.7, 1.21.2, 1.25.4, 5.3.2, 5.3.4, 5.9.4, 5.11.6, 5.12.8, 5.15.3, 5.18.1-2, 5.21.7-8, 6.35.2-3, 5.45.7, 5.47.9, 5.51.7, 5.62.8, 5.69.11, 5.79.4, 5.77.5, 5.79.6, 5.79.8, 5.94.11.

ἐνδείκνυμαι: 5.9.1.

καθέστηκα, κατέστην: 1.2.5, 1.4.4, 1.5.2, 1.24,5-6, 5.1.2, 5.37.10.

καλέομαι: 1.23.7.

ὑπάρχω: 5.57.5.
φαίνομαι: 5.37.3.
ψηφίζομαι: 5.88.7-8.
εἰμί: all other examples.

4.1 Parts

As may be seen from lists I, II, these have only two parts in common: the articled participle and (once) ταῦτα. It is therefore usually easy to distinguish in each case the subject from the predicative.

However, this is not without problems. What differentiates most of the pairs appearing both in I and II is the DEFINITENESS of the subject. When no such difference is recorded, there is a partial NEUTRALIZATION of parts. For example, of a personal pronoun (always definite) cooccurring with an articled participle in one clause, which should be considered subject? In principle, the person-number dependence (4.2.1) decides here, as in 1.11.6 ἐγώ (I)... εἰμι... ὁ θέλων (II) (See also 5.90.6). But where person and number are the same, neutralization is complete: 5.25.1 τὰ μὲν γενόμενα ταῦτ' ἐστιν, 5.30.4-5 οὗτος ἦν ὁ πεισθεὶς...[21]. The same is true for clauses where one of the parts is not clearly marked for definiteness: τὶς, οἵτινες, πολλοί, εἰ + clause, ὅτε + clause (see table 4.0.1). In all these cases no formal distinction holds, and the terms *subject*, *predicative* become useless, the way they are in the non-verbal model (§2). What we may do (and what we have done) is apply other criteria, knowing them to be different: (a) when one of the parts is a personal pronoun (cf. οὗτος above), we may take it for the subject, on the force of 4.2.1 below (but

[21] The articled participle is perhaps, in this position, not as definite as might seem from the fact that it has the article. An unarticled participle would not make subject or predicative of a copula model, but would rather be felt as forming a periphrastic tense with the "copula", e.g. οὗτος ἦν πεισθείς. Therefore, in the frame of the copula model, there is no opposition between definite and indefinite participles. For unarticled participles with finite verbs see below, 4.1.2.

ταῦτα above does not fit here). (b) in a general way, we may use the Given and New bipartition taking the former as subject, the latter as predicative. But we should remember that this functional-semantic bipartition is quite different from formal subject-predicative distinction.

One problematic instance which has not been included in the table 4.0.1 above: 5.44.2 (καὶ ἀπέθανε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτοσὶ ἐγγὺς τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πλοίων,) ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος ἐστίν. "(And that man died close to the sea and to the boats,) as their version is". Here ὁ τούτων λόγος seems subject; but what is predicative? We may suppose the relative ὡς contains some anaphoric which is predicative, approximately "as *what* their version is"; but proof is not easy. A simpler, even if less probable solution is to consider ἐστίν as a non-copula statal verb: "as their version stands" (cf. below 5.1).

4.1.1 With one kind of part II expressions, namely with phrases containing the preposition ἐν it is often impossible to tell whether the prepositional phrase should be seen as a predicative of a copula model or as a complement of an intransitive verb in the active verbal model (§10) or in the "there is" model (5.1). As a matter of fact, this is a neutralization of these three models: 5.32.4 ἐν τούτῳ (II) γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐστιν (III) ἡ ὠφέλεια (I) "For their gain lies (is) in this".

Some examples, however, are clearly copula clauses, as is apparent from their content: 5.89.4 Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τούτων αἰτίασις (I) οὐκ ἔχει τέλος, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑμῖν (II) ἐστι (III) καὶ τῇ δίκῃ (II) "Because their accusation is not final, but the matter is in your hands and in the judging". Here it is hardly possible to translate "... but it exists in you (in your hands)..." as it is not a question of existence at all, but of the place WHERE the thing is.

Some times the prepositional phrase may seem a complement of an existential clause with prepositions other than ἐν: 5.88.1-3 (Αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων ἕνεκα οἵ τε νόμοι... καὶ τἆλλα) ὅσα γίγνεται τῶν δικῶν ἕνεκα τοῦ φόνου,... "(For all this the rules and... all the rest) which is (exists?) for the purpose of trials of murder,...". But in other cases of ἕνεκα a copula-model is certain: 5.22.8 τοῦ δὲ ὑετοῦ ἕνεκα (II) ταῦτα (I) ἦν. "This was ("happened"

not "existed") on account of the rain." Similarly: 5.28.3 ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λιμένος ἦν τὸ πλοῖον. "The boat was (not "existed"!) from the same port." Owing to these clearer instances of copula clauses we have included all prepositional phrases in the present model. At least a partial proof for the rightness of this decision is to be found in a case like the following, where the coordination of an adjective and a prepositional phrase show their appurtenance to the same paradigm:

5.62.5 ἅπερ (I) <u>μέγιστα</u> (II) καὶ <u>περὶ πλείστου</u> (II) ἐστὶν (III) ἀνθρώποις. "What is the greatest and the most important for men."

The other clauses with prepositional groups are:

εἰς: 5.8.1, 5.37.10.

ἐν: 1.1.5, 1.8.3, 1.17.1, 1.19.7, 1.22.7, 1.29.2, 1.29.3, 1.31.2, 5.6.3-4, 5.7.3, 5.28.4, 5.45.5, 5.45.6, 5.66.2-3, (5.66.4-5 is a complement of the model).

ἕνεκα: 1.23.7, 5.79.8.

ἐξ: 5.1.2, 5.28.3, 5.51.5, 5.51.7, 5.64.5-6.

ἐπί: 5.3.7.

κατά: 5.86.4.

πρός: 5.32.2-3, 5.46.8.

4.1.1.1 The adverb ἔνδον too may be considered an equivalent of a prepositional phrase. It is the only adverb admitted in the copula model as predicative (adverbs *within* model-parts do not count here). This seems possible because of its semantic affinity with ἐν-phrases, but has some more formal base: ἔνδον is one of a small group of "adverbs" which do not oppose any corresponding adjective: δίχα, χωρίς, ἑκάς, ἐγγύς, etc. (Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §353,4 Anm. 2). Such forms are "adjective" and "adverb" at the same time, like English *far* or *fast*.

4.1.2 A question which naturally arises is whether to include in our model combinations of a finite verb-form with a nominative participle like 5.34.2-3 ἀπέκτειναν <u>ἄγοντες</u> τὸν ἄνδρα. "They brought the man and killed him."; 5.20.4 ἐτύγχανε ἐκεῖ ὢν τότε "he happened to be there at the time"; 5.29.6 ἐφαίνετο τῶν προβάτων ὂν αἷμα "it proved to be the sheep's blood". At first sight these have the same parts as other clauses of the copula model, but at the same time they seem different. An examination of

all instances in the corpus seems to show that these three examples constitute three different constructions:

4.1.2.1 Verbs in the verbal model accompanied by what is sometimes called "conjunct participle", i.e. a gerund, accompanying the main verb. These count many different verbs, intransitive as well as transitive (cf. 5.34.2-3 ἀπέκτειναν cited above). They do not belong here but should be treated among other constructions expanding the verbal phrase, in the frame of the active verbal model. (Cf. e.g. 1.3.4, 5.19.1, 5.24.5, 5.70.4-5, 5.76.4, 5.93.10, etc.)

4.1.2.2 "Compound" verbs, made up of a finite "aspect" auxiliary and a participle as main lexical entry. As auxiliaries were recorded τυγχάνω "happen to be" (5.20.4, 5.21.1, 5.32.4-5, 5.37.7, 5.65.7); παύομαι "cease" (5.31.4-5, 5.41.1, 5.50.5) and οἴχομαι "be off, go away" (5.13.2, 5.24.7, 5.25.5, 5.25.8, 5.69.4-5).

These "compound" verbs are technically similar to clauses in our model; but they never take any other predicative except the unarticled participle, and may therefore be better described under verbal aspect categories. It is interesting to note that an auxiliary can itself be periphrastic, built up as a copula model: below §11.4.

4.1.2.3 The third class consists, in our corpus, of the verbs φαίνομαι "appear, seem", ἀπελέγχομαι "be proved".
5.22.1-2 οὔτ' αὖ ἐγὼ ἄνευ προφάσεως ἱκανῆς <u>φαίνομαι</u> τὸν πλοῦν <u>ποιησάμενος</u> εἰς τὴν Αἶνον, "Nor again do I seem to make the trip to Aenos without motive," (cf. also 5.29.6, 5.77.2); 5.21.7 οὔτε γὰρ <u>πείσας</u> τὸν ἄνδρα οὐδαμοῦ <u>ἀπελέγχομαι</u> σύμπλουν μοι γενέσθαι, "For neither am I anywhere proved to have convinced the man to go on board with me,".

These verbs are all passive-intransitive counterparts of verbs of showing, proving etc., which as a rule (Kühner-Gerth, 1904: §482,2) have for object a nexus of an accusative with a participle. The passive model, as is usual, makes it possible not to name the acting subject (the one who showed, proved, etc.) (for this cf. our "fourth" person 5.3, 6.4.1).[22] But the passive model is not

[22] But the agent is not excluded, as shows the following example

(in these verbs at least, cf. below 11.1) compatible with an accusative object, which is accordingly in the nominative: φαίνομαι... ποιησάμενος and the like. The construction should therefore be treated with the passive clause (§8). But, since the predicative participle is not normally a part of the passive clause, we shall treat examples such as the ones above with "second degree" phenomena, below 11.3.

4.1.3 Certain expressions are open to interpretation as one attributive construction or as a part I neighbouring a part II:

4.1.3.1 5.95.5-6 τί ἔσται πλέον τῷ γε ἀποθανόντι; is either "What advantage (τί πλέον) will there be to the murdered? ("there-is" model, cf. below 5.2), or "What will be the advantage to the murdered? (copula model). The same expression is recorded with μηδὲν, οὐδὲν for τί; 5.16.4-5 ὥστε μηδέν μοι πλέον εἶναι. See also 5.80.6, 5.93.3.

4.1.3.2 Another dubious case is that with ὄνομα: 5.70.6 Σωσίαν ὄνομά φασιν αὐτῷ εἶναι: either "They say he has the name Sosias" (Σωσίαν ὄνομα as an apposition, hence "there is" model, cf. 5.2) or "They say he has Sosias for a name" (predicative nexus between Σωσίαν and ὄνομα, hence copula model).

4.2 Dependences

4.2.1 There exists a dependence between the subject and the copula: they have the same person and number. The personal pronouns of the first and second person are in a bilateral dependence[23] with the personal element of the copula (a change in one of them brings about a change in the other).

All other subjects (including the third person pronouns) viewed as one paradigm, contract a bilateral dependence with the third

---

(not in our present corpus): 2.δ.10.6 τά τε ἴχνη τοῦ φόνου οὐκ εἰς ἐμὲ φέροντα... ἀποδέδεικται <u>ὑπ' αὐτῶν</u>.

[23] For *bilateral dependence* see Garvin 1972: 70; Frei 1968: 65 uses the term *dépendence réciproque*. Both are traceable to Hjelmslev's *interdependence* (1961: 33-41). See also Barri, 1975 for an analysis of a relevant case.

person element of the copula. But within this paradigm, every member e.g. the infinitive, εἰ clauses, etc., is in unilateral dependence with the third-person element of the copula, for this element is presupposed by each of the subjects, but does not itself presuppose any one of them.

It is worthwhile to mention here a trait found in our text, which is common to many Indo-European and other languages: in a copula clause, when one of the parts is a personal pronoun, this pronoun is invariably the one which contracts dependences with the copula, i.e. it is the subject[24]. This is one of the traits of copula clauses which justifies the distinction between subject and predicative which otherwise could be distinguished only by their respective Given or New status. See for example 1.11.6 ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι... ὁ θέλων... "It is I... who wants..." (cf. also 5.30.4-5, 5.90.6, etc.). As for number, the infinitive and εἰ-model are joined with the singular copula, πολλοί, naturally, with the plural; plural neuters take a singular copula, according to the well known rule. These are unilateral dependences.

4.2.2 When the predicative is an adjective, an articled participle, or ὅστις it is dependent on the subject as to number and gender. This is a bilateral dependence. All other sorts of predicatives are independent of the other parts.

4.3 Negation

Finite indicative copula is negated by οὐ or its combinations (οὐδέ, οὐδέν): 5.94.1 Τὸ δὲ τοὺς κατηγόρους διαβάλλειν (I) <u>οὐδέν</u> ἐστι θαυμαστόν (II) "That my accusers calumniate me is not at all remarkable".

The same negation is used for nominal phrases inside the clause: 5.94.9-10 <u>οὔ</u> τοι τῶν ἐπειγομένων (II) ἐστί τὰ πράγματα (I) (ἀλλὰ

---

[24] I am grateful to Prof. H.J. Polotsky for this point, as well as for the Turkish example *Yezid bende'dir, benim* "Yezid is in me, is me" (literally "Yezid is in me, am me"), where the second "me", *ben*, determines the person of the copula -im, instead of the subject *Yezid*. (From *Yezidin Kizi* by R.H. Karay, p. 61).

τῶν εὖ βουλομένων). "These things are not to the hasty, (but to those who consider well)."

Participles are usually negated by οὐ:
1.9.6 ταύτην (I) τε <u>οὐκ</u> οὖσαν ἄπαρνον (II),... "she, unable to deny...". When they have μὴ they convey a condition:
5.87.4 ἀνάγκη γὰρ... καὶ μὴ ὄντα φονέα μηδ' ἔνοχον τῷ φόνῳ χρῆσθαι τῇ δίκῃ "one must... even if he is not the murderer nor concerned with the murder, obey the verdict...".

No μὴ negations with other moods were recorded.

4.4 Omissions

4.4.1 The subject cannot possibly be omitted when the copula remains. The reason is that the copula contains a person-number ending which in full clauses is dependent on the subject (4.2.1), but which is itself subject when no subject-word is present. Thus the status of the ending is wholly different in the two situations, but the subject is never lacking. (This sheds a new light on the dependences described above: those between subject and copula are of the kind holding between elements of the same phrase, e.g. of appositions[25]; those between the predicative and the subject are construction rules of the clause.) The subject may be omitted together with the copula: 5.10.2 (φασὶ δὲ αὖ τό γε ἀποκτείνειν (I) μέγα κακούργημα (II) εἶναι (III), καὶ ἐγὼ ὁμολογῶ) μέγιστόν (II) γε. "(It is again said that killing is a great malefaction, and I agree) that it is the greatest." See also 5.9.3, 5.61.1-2.

4.4.2 As with the subject, the predicative too has not been found to be omitted alone, but always together with the copula: 5.10.2 φασὶ δὲ αὖ τό γε ἀποκτείνειν μέγα κακούργημα (II) εἶναι

---

[25] It could be argued that this statement makes it more appropriate to posit the copula model in a different way: Part I would be the copula ending, Part II the predicative, and Part III the copula-stem. Any separate subject-word would be seen as apposition to the copula ending. But there would remain to be explained the dependences between this subject-word and the predicative. In my opinion it is precisely the status change of the ending which is characteristic of all verbs, including copula verbs.

(III), καὶ ἐγὼ ὁμολογῶ μέγιστόν γε), καὶ τὸ ἱεροσυλεῖν (I), καὶ τὸ προδιδόναι τὴν πόλιν (I). "(It is again said that killing is a great malefaction, and I agree that it is the greatest) and also sacrilege (I), and also betraying the city (I)." The reason for this double omission of predicative and copula seems to lie, unlike the double omission of subject and copula, in the Given-New relationship in the clause. (As is known, no New can ever be omitted, for it constitutes the *raison d'être* of the clause.)

4.4.3 The copula can be omitted when the clause comes immediately after a full copula clause:
5.91.3 (τὸ (I) μὲν γὰρ ἁμάρτημα μόνον (II) ἐστί (III)), τὸ δὲ ἕτερον (I) καὶ ἀσέβημα (II). "(The one is only a mistake), the other is also a sin." See also 5.5.8, 5.22.7-8, 5.54.6, 5.63.2-3, 5.74.4, 5.92.4. In most examples with subject and predicative but no copula, we would speak of a non-verbal clause. It is only the context which decides what kind of clause we posit.

In fact, some of the non-verbal examples discussed (§3) follow copula clauses: 5.79.10-11 (Πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶ τὰ συμβαλλόμενα τοῖς βουλομένοις τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐφίεσθαι.) γέρων μὲν ἐκεῖνος ὥστ' ἐμοὶ βοηθεῖν, "(And there are many things which favour those who seek to lay hands on the property of others.) He is too old to help me,". The previous sentence (in brackets has no connexion with the non-verbal clause, so that we do not feel entitled to "complete" the latter with a copula ἐστί from the former. It may still be true that a preceding ἐστί, either copula or "there is" (§5) clause makes the appearance of a non-verbal one more probable. See also 5.85.7, 5.88.5, 5.94.3, 5.94.5, 5.94.7[26].

4.5 Presentation type

Most clauses are assertions. A few examples of questions are

---

[26] As we mentioned above (§0) Kühner-Gerth speak of "Ellipse des Verbs εἶναι" for all cases of what we call *non-verbal clause* (1898: §354; cf. also Schwyzer 1950: 623). But the irrecognition of *Kopulaartige Verba* arouses the question, why should εἶναι alone be the omitted copula. (See §4.7.1 below.)

recorded (indirect questions do not differ from other included clauses and will not be treated here).

5.45.9 ταῦτα (I)... πῶς εἰκότα (II) ἐστίν; "These matters, how can they seem true?" (cf. 5.92.4).

5.95.5-6 τί (I) ἔσται πλέον (II) τῷ γε ἀποθανόντι...; "What will be the gain of the dead one...?".

5.36.6 καὶ πότερ' ἀληθῆ (II) ἐστιν ὅτ' ἔφη...(I) ἢ ὅτ' οὐκ ἔφη (I); "And is it the truth when he said... or when he denied?".

Word order in questions is the same as in assertions except when a prominent interrogative attracts the copula to immediately follow it (below, 4.6).

Exclamations are not easily discernible from assertions, owing to the general rhetorical spirit. One imperative copula example was recorded: 5.94.11 νῦν μὲν οὖν γνωρισταὶ γίγνεσθε τῆς δίκης, "So now get to know the case,". Possible exclamations are 1.11.6, 1.18.1, 1.22.5.

4.6 Word Order

Word order is only partly reflected by our formula Subject-Predicative-Copula. What is reflected is the fact that in the great majority of examples, the copula follows the predicative: 5.82.8-9 πολλοὶ (I)... καταφανεῖς (II) ἐγένοντο. What is not conveyed is that the subject may follow the other two: 5.23.5 ἀφανὴς (II) ἦν ὁ ἀνήρ (I).

What seems to underlie this order is the relative prominence, or "sentence stress" of the predicative, to which the weakly-stressed copula is attached. This hypothesis is strengthened by cases where the copula comes between an adjective and its following noun, (both constituting part II) presumably because of the relative prominence of the first: 5.14.5 ὅπερ (I) ΜΕΓΙΣΤΟΝ ἐστι σημεῖον "Which is a VERY GOOD sign". Attachement of weak words to prominent ones is known in other situations (cf. the classic Wackernagel, 1892). It is a mechanical, phonetic phenomenon, but it may help recognize an important feature of the clause, as the presumably prominent word is in most cases shown by the context

to be the New of the clause:

5.5.6-7 Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ῥῆμα (I) ΤΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΗΣ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑ (II) ἐστι, (τὸ δὲ ἔργον τῆς γνώμης). "For talking is SIN OF THE TONGUE (whereas a deed, of the conscience.)"

5.28.3 ... ΕΞ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΛΙΜΕΝΟΣ (II) ἦν τὸ πλοῖον (I). "The boat was FROM THE SAME PORT."

5.9.4 αὐτοὶ οὗτοι (I) τούτου γε ΜΑΡΤΥΡΕΣ (II) γεγένηνται. "They themselves became WITNESSES for this."

1.2.4 ... οὓς (I) εἰκὸς ἦν τῷ μὲν τεθνεῶτι ΤΙΜΩΡΟΥΣ (II) γενέσθαι, "Who should have become HELPERS to the dead man,".

5.45.6 ... ἃ οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἄν τις (I) ΟΙΟΣ ΤΕ (II) ἐγένετο, "... which not even by day COULD one do,".

5.51.5-6 καὶ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἐξ ἴσου γενόμενα (I)ΤΟΥ ΦΕΥΓΟΝΤΟΣ (II) ἐστι, "Now equal opinions belong to (=are in favour of) THE ACCUSED,".

5.91.2 ...τὸ ἀδίκως ἀπολῦσαι (I) ΟΣΙΩΤΕΡΟΝ (II) ἂν εἴη. "discharging on no ground should be MORE HALLOWED." Etc.

However, the New is not necessarily the predicative. In a few examples it is the subject, a fact shown (apart from contextual information) by the attachment of the copula to it: 1.11.6 νῦν δ' ΕΓΩ γάρ εἰμι τοῦτο μὲν ὁ θέλων (αὐτὸς βασανιστὴς γενέσθαι, τοῦτο δὲ ...)". 5.30.4-5 (ὅν... ἐβασάνισαν...) ΟΥΤΟΣ ἦν ὁ πεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τούτων καὶ καταψευσάμενος ἐμοῦ. "(The one.. they examined...) it was HE who was induced by them so as to incriminate me falsely." 5.90.6 ἀλλ' ΥΜΕΙΣ ἔσεσθε οἱ κἀκεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ διαψηφιζόμενοι. "But it will be YOU who will be my judges there too." See also 1.2.5, 1.8.3.

These examples, as I have tried to show in translating them, are of the "polemic" New sort, rendered best in English by the cleft sentence.

In other clauses, the copula itself seems to be the New: 5.25.2-3 (Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ πρὶν ἀνάγεσθαί με εἰς τὴν Αἶνον,) ὅτε ΗΝ ἀφανὴς (II) ὁ ἀνήρ (I), "(First of all, before I went to Aenos,) when the man WAS (already) missing,". (Cf. the beginning of the story: 5.23.5 ἐπειδὴ ΑΦΑΝΗΣ ἦν ὁ ἀνήρ. "When the man was MISSING.") See also 5.86.4.

In still other examples it is one of the complements of the

predicative or the copula which is the New:
5.94.1 τὸ δὲ τοὺς κατηγόρους διαβάλλειν (I) ΟΥΔΕΝ ἐστι θαυμαστόν (II). "That my accusers should calumniate me, is BY NO MEANS remarkable."
1.12.3 (εἰ γὰρ... ἐγὼ μὴ ἐδεξάμην,) ΤΟΥΤΟΙΣ ἂν ἦν ταῦτα (I) τεκμήρια (II). "(Had... I not shown, it is FOR THEM that these would have been evidence." Cf. 1.20.7.

In a few clauses, there occur other prominent words which "attract" the copula. Such words are primarily negations and interrogatives; they are usually the New of their clauses:
1.9.6 τὰ τούτων ἀνδράποδα... συνῄδει.. ταύτην (I) τε ΟΥΚ οὖσαν ἄπαρνον (II), "Their slaves... knew too... that she could NOT deny,".
5.87.4 (ἀνάγκη γὰρ,)... καὶ ΜΗ ὄντα φονέα (II) χρῆσθαι τῇ δίκῃ. "(It must be)... that even he who is NOT murderer, should obey the judgement."
5.92.4 Ἑκούσιον δὲ ΠΩΣ ἂν εἴη μᾶλλον ἢ... "And HOW should it be more voluntary than...". See also 5.95.5-6.

There are, however, examples where the New, as understood from the context of the clause, does not coincide with the words placed before the copula. This seems to be more frequent in included clauses, where the verb is in the infinitive, but is not limited to them. Here there seem to be valid other, subtler rules of word order, which we cannot as yet make explicit:
1.15.7 ... εἶναι φάσκοθσα αὐτῆς μὲν τοῦτο εὕρημα, ἐκείνης δ' ὑπηρέτημα. "... saying it was her finding, but for the other woman to execute." See also 1.6.8, 5.15.5, 5.22.8, 5.63.2, 5.66.4.

4.7 Discussion

4.7.1 As said above, 0.1, most grammars do not make much of the difference between a clause containing a "normal" verb and one with a copula and a predicative. However, the difference is important: unlike the verbal model, the verb in the (finite) copula-model has a "complement" in the nominative (noun, adjective, articled participle, etc.). More important still, this complement (part II)

by its sense as well as the dependences (above 4.2) it contracts, is connected both to the verb and to part I. This makes this model a three-position one, as against the two positions in the verbal model.

The list of copulas recorded in our corpus was given above, 4.0.3. This list suffices to show that the copula function is not limited to the verb εἰμί nor to "similar" verbs. It is obvious that it is not the verb as a lexical entity which makes the clause a copula model. In fact, all verbs appearing in the present model figure also in other models. Even the most typical (and most frequent) copulas εἰμί and γίγνομαι are found in the "there-is" model (§5), in the normative statement model (§6), and in the active verbal model itself (§10)[27]. Therefore, what makes a verb a COPULA is its surroundings, i.e. the clause-model in which it appears[28].

This concerns the *signifiant* side of the model. It is characteristic of the *signifié* of the verbs put in the copula clause that they have a weaker semantic force than the "same verbs" figuring e.g. in the Active Verbal clause. Copulas are often said to be of *incomplete predication*. For example φαίνομαι, when in the verbal clause, means "appear, be seen, be shown" but as a copula

---

[27] The verb γίγνομαι figures quite often in the verbal model, whereas εἰμί is rather rare, but still possible. Some of Kühner-Gerth's (1898: §353,4) examples are relevant here, as Eurip. Hec. 284 Κἀγὼ γὰρ ἦν ποτ' ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἰμ' ἔτι. Our small corpus has only one doubtful example: 5.44.2 καὶ ἀπέθανε ὁ ἀνὴρ οὕτωσι... ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος ἐστίν. "And the man died thus ... as their version stands." (For another interpretation see above 4.1). For γίγνομαι and other verbs in full verbal force see Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §355 Anm. 1. See also below, 5.1.1.2.3.

[28] Kühner-Gerth (1898: §355) do not seem to have fully decided how to present this fact. In principle, their formulation resembles ours: "Ausser der eigentlichen Kopula εἶναι giebt es noch eine Anzahl von Verben, welche den Charakter [=the model (N.B.)] der Kopula annehmen, indem sie geichfalls ein prädikatives Adjectiv oder Substantiv mit dem Subjekte verbinden...". But the title *Kopulaartige Verben*, and the (rather long) list they give, again makes it look as if it was those verbs as LEXICAL entities which make the copula clause. A similar undecided attitude in Aerts (1965: 7, note 1): "As 'copula' ὑπάρχειν εὑρίσκεσθαι, τυγχάνειν sometimes occur. These instances are only given incidentally in this study".

it signifies "seem s o m e t h i n g ", as in 5.37.3 οἱ... λόγοι ἀληθέστεροι φαίνονται "the... version seems truer". The much weaker meaning is due to the model.

4.7.2 We still may ask what is the relation of the construction Copula-predicative to a verb in the verbal model or in the "there is" model. There is a similarity between these: the person-number dependences holding between the subject and the copula (4.2.2).

As we showed above, one way of formulating this would be to present the group made up by copula + predicative as a single verbal expression, where the copula is a "derivational" element rather similar to denominative verbal suffixes like -έω, -ίζω, etc. For example, certain adjectives found as predicative in the model, like ἐνδεής, ἀντίδικος, κρείσσων, μέγιστος, etc., do not have corresponding verbs, at least in Antiphon (Cleef, 1895: svv.). The copula derives, as it were, verbs out of them. This view is of course not new; we know that already Aristotle equated ὁ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζει with ὁ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζων ἐστί (cf. Steinthal, 1890: I,241 ; of course ῥῆμα in Aristotle is not to be directly translated by "verb"), thus staying within the same kind of clause.

In one class of participial part II this is no doubt the case: phrases like 1.8.5 ἀντομωμοκὼς ἔσται have long been recognized (e.g. Goodwin, 1894: §706) as suppletive to the verb system. They have not been included in our discussion. A little different are the cases like 5.88.4 τἆλλα... πολὺ διαφέροντά ἐστιν. These have been described as a progressive tense form (for the NT; cf. G. Björck, 1938-40; Aerts, 1965 and literature cited there) or again as Given-tenses (for Herodotus as well as NT; cf. Rosén, 1957; 1962: §35; 1967b). Whether these have to be incorporated into the verbal system, and in what capacity, remains to be carefully studied, since no final conclusion has as yet been reached at. They too have been excluded from the present model.

As for copula clauses that do not form a part of the verbal system *stricto sensu*, it is not simple to equate them with verbal ones. First, there is the number-gender dependences between the subject and the predicative, for which there is no parallel in the verbal phrase. Second, certain adjectives, as ἀφανής do have in Antiphon a corresponding verb: ἀφανίζω (similarly πιστός εἰμι:

πιστεύω, ἄπιστός εἰμι ἀπιστέω, τιμωρός εἰμι: τιμωρέω, etc.). This opposition makes the copula clause more than a suppletive variant of the verbal one.

Third, one should remember that in treating the copula like a verbalizing element, we have to do not with one such element, but with a paradigm of copula-verbs: most such verbs cannot be said to be "abstract" or empty of the "lexical" meaning. It thus seems appropriate to treat the phenomenon as a free syntactic frame or MODEL, rather than press down all possibilities into the verbal one. I have therefore treated as copula model all clauses made up of the three "positions" described above except for those with an unarticled participle as part II (4.1.2). Only a detailed research into the complicated relations of the present model with the others will be able to decide about their ultimate status. As mentioned above, traditional treatment tends to disregard their differences; it is perhaps better to make up for this in the present treatment, by keeping the models apart.

4.7.3 All the above makes it difficult to state what is the specific function of this model. It seems, in a very general way, to be the combination of a Given to a New, when both are not verbs. In the case (rather rare) of two nouns (but by no means in all sorts of copula clauses; cf. Benveniste, 1950: 27) we may further speak of an "equational clause", e.g. 5.35.2-3 ... ὁ ἀνήρ ... κατήγορος ἂν ἐγίγνετο... "...the man... would have become an accuser...".

What then is the difference between the copula model and the non-verbal one? They have essentially the same paradigms for parts I and II and seem both to have the Given-New function described above. The answer is perhaps to be sought first of all in the relative frequency of both models: there is no real competition between the two, the non-verbal clause being rather rare. If we were right about the exclamatory, impatient quality of the latter, we remain with the copula model as the normal, unhurried expression of the Given-New relation between non-verbs (without, of course, excluding eventual exclamatory uses).

"THERE-IS" AND "THERE-IS-TO" CLAUSES

In the following sections two rather similar models (or sub-models) will be treated. First, each will be described apart, then a common discussion (5.3) will follow.

"THERE-IS" (EXISTENCE) CLAUSE

I	II
Existing Entity	*Existential Impersonal Form*
Noun } nominative[29]	Third person[29] of:
Articled participle } nominative[29]	γίγνεσθαι
ὅ τι + clause	εἶναι
ὅπου + clause	φαίνεσθαι

Examples:

5.16.8 Καίτοι πῶς <u>ἂν</u> <u>εἴη</u> τούτων δεινότερα μηχανήματα,...; "How can there be more terrible manoeuvres,...?". See also 1.14.1, 5.94.5-6, 5.47.5-6.

5.72.2 οὐ γὰρ <u>ἔστιν</u> ὅ τι ἂν ὀργιζόμενος... εὖ γνοίῃ "For there is nothing that may be well understood by a furious man". See also 5.77.3-4, 5.83.4, 5.89.5.

5.37.8-9 τοὺς δὲ προτέρους λόγους... <u>ἦσαν</u> οἱ ἀφανιοῦντες. "There were those who would obliterate the previous... testimonies." See also 5.87.10.

5.6.3 (ἀνάγκη ἐνθυμεῖσθαι) τῶν <u>ἐσομένων</u>. "(One must remember) what will be." See also 5.69.8.

5.27.3 οὔτε ὀπτὴρ οὐδεὶς <u>ἐφάνη</u> οὔτε αἷμα οὔτε ἄλλο σημεῖον οὐδέν. "There appeared no one who had seen him nor blood nor any other sign." See also 5.45.3.

5.71.7-8 τούτων οὐκ ἂν γένοιντο ἕτεροι πονηρότεροι σύμβουλοι. "There can be (come to be) no other, worse counselors than these."

---

[29] In included clauses the Existing Entity is sometimes in the accusative, the Impersonal Form in the infinitive; in others this form is in the participle. Cf. note 13.

5.1.1 Parts

5.1.1.1 The existing entity

In expressions which have case inflexion, this part is in the nominative. Nouns are always indefinite (a trait which explains why pronouns are not members of this class)[30]. This apparently does not apply to the two examples (5.37.8-9, 5.87.10) of participles. But an unarticled participle (e.g. ἦσαν ἀφανιοῦντες) would have been analyzed as part of a periphrastic verb-form of the type ἦν διδάσκων or some other type (§4.1.2). Thus there is no real opposition in this environment between articled and unarticled participles. The article here does not make definite, but substantivizes the participle (cf. note 21).

Dubious cases concerning indefiniteness are:

5.85.7 <u>δύο</u> ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀγῶνος γεγένησθον "There were born two trials out of one".

5.31.3 τῇ βασάνῳ, <u>οἷα</u> γεγένηται "the inquiry, how it happened".

5.84.2-3 ὡς <u>τι</u> ἀνόσιον γεγένηται "that something unholy happened".

5.21.6 αὐτὰ ταῦτα σκοπεῖτε, ὅτι <οὐ τῇ ἐ> μῇ προνοίᾳ ἐγίγνετο ἢ τύχῃ. "Consider that these things have happened not by my premeditation, but by chance." It is true that part I, αὐτὰ ταῦτα, is definite but we should remember that αὐτός conditions definiteness in the noun (pronoun) it expands, thus neutralizing definiteness. Still, these examples have not been included, because of the meaning of ἐγίγνετο. They were transferred to the active verbal model, together with all cases of definite part I (see 1.18.4, 5.22.5, 5.22.6, 5.26.7, 5.76.2, 5.82.9-10, 5.83.4). The decision as to the kind of model found in this γίγνεται cases would have been easier if τι and δύο could have been considered

---

[30] Cf. Polotsky's (1960: §33) description of the Coptic "there-is" clause: "The subject [=existing entity] is never a personal pronoun. As a rule it is one of the following: nouns with indefinite or zero article...". Till (1966: §287) has essentially the same statement. For the tendency of indefinite subjects of another model to take a "superfluous" there-is expression see Polotsky, 1960: §35, Till, 1966: §288. For Greek Aerts, 1965: 7, incidentally remarks that an indefinite "subject" goes with an *es gibt* meaning of εἶναι.

indefinite. Actually, τις does commute with DEFINITE nouns in the subject of the copula model (§4) and it is difficult to judge the status of numerals or οἷα concerning definiteness. Decision then must be based on the meaning of the impersonal form. See also 5.1.1.2.1.

5.1.1.2 Existential impersonal form

At a first reading, the "verbs" in the list (5.1) seem to correspond to those in the copula model presented in §4. This resemblance soon disappears, as we become aware of two essential properties:

5.1.1.2.1 The list seems to be a closed one, thus differing sharply from the list of copulas. It may well be that reading the four Antiphontean speeches left out of the present corpus will add one such "verb" or two; similarly, other writers may have a slightly different paradigm; but the list is in each case a closed one. In the present case it may even have to be shortened by one, leaving out ἐφάνη (5.27.3, 5.45.3) as suspect of belonging to the active verbal model (§10) or at least of neutralizing the opposition between the two models.

5.1.1.2.2 Only the "third person" is possible, mostly singular, sometimes plural (for a possible example of the dual see above 5.1.1.1). This is why we have called it IMPERSONAL and why we use *form* rather than *verb*: paradigmatic inflection for persons belongs to the very definition of the Greek finite verb. Structurally, in the present model a form like ἐστί or γίγνεται is no "third person" at all because its ending, although homonymous with third person endings in verbs, is not commutable with other personal endings. The ending here is therefore devoid of any linguistic value.

One should note that the above means no less than the establishing of a new "part of speech" for the form of Greek discussed here, which has in common with verbs the categories of aspect, tense, mood and number, but not of person. Such traditional creations as "impersonal verb" are contradictions in terms and have to be abandoned. Of course, it is easier to admit of an impersonal existential form in languages where no external resemblance to the

personal verb may disturb us: French *il y a*, coptic *oun̄* (negated: *nn̄*; cf. Till, 1966: §287) or Hebrew *yeš* (negated *eyn*; cf. Rosén 1975: §5.6.2)[31]. Still, structural considerations should always overpower formal similarity; it is those that we have here.

5.1.1.2.3 The impersonal forms may be connected with full finite verbs: γίγνεσθαι, φαίνεσθαι, εἶναι. These verbs may appear in the active verbal model as intransitives. When they are in the third person, with an indefinite subject, the clause neutralizes the verbal and the "there-is" models. Decision is in such a case theoretically impossible. All we can do is state the probability of belonging to the one or the other model, judging by the meaning of the actual wording and the clause as a whole. Thus γίγνεσθαι which in the present model may be translated "come to be (there), come upon the stage, start existing" (Daneš 1967: 220; Liddell-Scott-Jones 1940: sv. II 4.) may elsewhere be a full verb, meaning "happen, take place" or "be born, be created" (Liddell-Scott-Jones 1940: sv. I; Cleef, 1895: s.v. 1). Some such examples (5.84.2-3, 5.85.7) were discussed above, 5.1.1.1. The same considerations apply to substantivized participles: 5.25.1 τὰ γενόμενα, 5.25.6 τὸ γεγενημένον neutralize personal inflection as well as definiteness (the article "is needed" for substantinizing); they can be rendered either "what there is" or "what happened". On the contrary, a participle expanding an indefinite noun will be considered belonging to the present model: 5.69.8 αἰτίαν... οὐκ οὖσαν "unexisting responsibility".

Practically all doubtful examples discussed above contained γίγνεσθαι forms. The last example brings to us the possibility of a verbal εἰμί, which is neither copula nor "there-is" impersonal form. Such a usage would be proved by finding (a) personal (first of second person) forms of εἰμί (b) accompanied by definite part I expressions. No such example was found in the whole of the text of Antiphon. But Kühner-Gerth (1898: §353,4) have some examples, which

---

[31] English *there is*, *there appears*, *there remains* (cf. Fries, 1952: 97), as well as German *es gibt* are nearer the Greek situation, in being special clause models using forms of otherwise"normal" verbs.

it would be well to examine here, for the light they may shed on our efforts (see, however, note 27 above).

Some of the examples would be treated by us as copula clauses, as Xen. Comm. 1.1.10 Σωκράτης ἀεὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, Xen. An. 7.3.43 etc. Others, as β 82, Thuk. 4,10 seem to form copula clauses with adverbial Predicate. Still others would have been included in the Normative Statement-model (§6), as H 424 Διαγνῶναι χαλεπῶς ἦν, or in our Instransitive Ergative clause (§9), as I 551 Κουρήτεσσι κακῶς ἦν "erging es schlecht".

There remain a few cases of what seems really fully verbal instances of εἰμί characterized by personal inflection. The clauses moreover contain definite subjects (and pronouns) and another element which seems to be wholly excluded from "there-is" clauses: adverbial expressions: Euripides, Hec. 284 Κἀγὼ γὰρ ἦν ποτ', ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἰμ' ἔτι. "I too lived once, but no longer do I live." Also: Z131, Λ762, Soph. Oed. Col. 392. To these may be added (after Schwyzer, 1950: 624 *Zus.* 1): σ 79, ω 263. Pl. Leg. 892,c Ψυχὴ λέγοιτ' ἂν εἶναι διαφερόντως φύσει is either verbal, or, with διαφερόντως taken to expand λέγοιτ' ἄν, is a "there-is" clause. All instances (not counting the last one) are archaic or archaizing poetry, i.e. a form of Greek rather far from Attic prose. Of course, the use of εἶναι in the "normal" verbal model may still have been alive even in prose. What should however be stressed, is that personal εἶναι stands in a different model than that of the impersonal "there-is".

5.1.1.2.4 As has been mentioned above, "there-is" clauses do not seem to admit of adverbial expressions. It is thus that I have left out 5.14.6 σημεῖον νόμων καλῶς κειμένων "a sign of laws well established". Otherwise, κεῖται could have been added to the list of impersonal "there-is" forms.

5.1.2 Dependences

The two parts contract between them a dependence of NUMBER, at least when part I has that category, i.e. when it is a noun or a

participle. This dependence is unilateral: a plural impersonal form is always accompanied by a plural object, whereas the opposite is not true: 5.16.8 πῶς ἂν εἴη... μηχανήματα etc. Cf. §5.2.2.

5.1.3 Negation

The clause is negated by οὐ or its compounds (οὐδεὶς, οὐδὲ, etc.) when the impersonal form is in the indicative (5.27.3, 5.45.3, 5.71.7-8, etc.), by μὴ where it is in the subjunctive (5.87.10). No negated infinitive was recorded. Cf. §5.2.3.

5.1.4 Omissions

The clause may be continued by οὔτε, οὐδὲ followed by another existing entity; it may then be said that the impersonal form is omitted. Another possibility is to see οὔτε, οὐδὲ not as a clause-conjuction, but as a part-connector. In any event, the proximity to the full clause makes supplying the missing impersonal easy. 5.77.3-4 (οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ,τι ὕστερον αὐτῷ ἡμάρτηται,) οὐδ᾽ ὅ τι (οὐ πεποίηται τῶν δεόντων,) "(There is no offence he has commited afterwards,) nor was there any (duty which he failed to do,)". See also 5.27.3, 5.45.3.

No omissions of the existing entity occurred. This may point to its New-status: by definition, a New cannot be missing, as it constitutes the very reason for the clause. This would agree well with its indefiniteness.

5.1.5 Presentation Type

One instance of interrogation was found: 5.16.8 πῶς ἂν εἴη τούτων δεινότερα μηχανήματα,... ; No clear exclamation occurs. Clauses with some emotional colouring may be 5.21.7-8, 5.72.2.

5.1.6 Word Order

5.1.6.1 Normal word order in assertive, unnegated clauses is the one presented above, §5.1: existing entity followed by impersonal form:
1.14.1 Ὑπερῷόν τι ἦν τῆς ἡμετέρας οἰκίας, ἣν... "There was an attic of our house, which...". See also 5.47.5-6.

Substantive and attributive negative compounds (οὐδείς, οὐδεμία) or negative connectives (οὐδέ, οὔτε) do not affect word order: 5.27.3, 5.45.3.

5.1.6.2 In negated clauses, the negative οὐ or μή attracts, as it were, the impersonal form to clause-beginning:
5.71.7-8 τούτων οὐκ ἂν γένοιντο... σύμβουλοι.
5.87.10 ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ τιμωρήσων.

This is also true for all examples of the type 5.83.4 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου οὐχί... See 5.89.5 and 5.72.2, 5.77.3-4.

5.1.6.3 In the same manner, an interrogative, presumably strongly accented, may explain the "attraction" of a there-is form to clause beginning:
5.16.8 πῶς ἂν εἴη τούτων δεινότερα μηχανήματα;

5.1.6.4 A stronger stress on the impersonal form seems to have changed normal order in 5.32.8 τοὺς δὲ προτέρους λόγους... ΗΣΑΝ οἱ ἀφανιοῦντες.

5.1.7 Discussion

The function of the "there-is" clause is to predicate the being-there, the existence, of something. In its meaning, such a clause does not differ much from a verbal, personal clause containing a verb which means "to exist" e.g. ὑπάρχω, κεῖμαι or "come into existence" as γίγνομαι.

Still, there is a difference. It is the difference between e.g. *There is a tree here* and *The tree exists here*: the first clause is free of any hint at a "general" process or state which

the tree undergoes; it is just there (even though it has to exist in order to be there). That is why it is preferable to use "THERE IS" CLAUSE rather than EXISTENTIAL or the like.

Another difference is that the present model mostly seems to present the existing entity as the New, or vital information, the "there is" form being, as it were, expected, Given. This is all the more understandable, as the existing entity is always indefinite, i.e. unmentioned before. It is moreover never omitted from the actual clause (§5.1.4). (In the verbal clause it is normally the verb which is the New even if this is not always the case.)

The "there-is" clause is an impersonal clause; it is not just that it contains an impersonal form, but the fact that the clause does not contain any personal element at all. The present model is not the only one of that kind. We shall see later some other impersonal clauses (§§6.7.4, 8.4.4.4)[32].

For the relation between the impersonal "there-is" clause and the possessional clause see below §5.3.

---

[32] An impersonal clause which is not represented in our corpus, but which is known from other texts, is that of the atmospherical "verbs" like ὕει.

"THERE-IS-TO" (POSSESSION) CLAUSE

I	II	III
Possessed	*Existential Impersonal Form*	*Possessor*
Nominative[33] case of:	Third person[33] of:	Dative case of:
(articled) noun	γίγνεσθαι	articled noun
τοῦτο	εἶναι	articled participle
τὰ αὐτά	τυγχάνειν	personal pronoun
ἅ	ὑπάρχειν	
ὄντα	ὑπολείπεσθαι	
οὐδείς		

Examples:

1.14.3 καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ παλλακή, "And he had a concubine,". See also 5.37.6, 5.57.1-2, 5.57.7, 5.58.5, 5.60.6, 5.63.4, 5.96.4-5.

5.24.6 πλοῦς τε ἡμῖν ἐγίγνετο "and we had a sailing due". Other γίγνεσθαι examples:

5.16.10 ἐμοὶ δ' ἅπαξ ἀποφυγόντι ὁ αὐτὸς κίνδυνος ὑπολείπεται. "But I have the same danger even if acquitted once." See also 5.85.6.

5.26.9-10 οὔτε τῷ ἀπάγοντι νύκτωρ μακρὰν ὁδὸν ἡ πρόφασις ἂν εἰκότως ἐγίγνετο. "nor did the one who carried him in the night a long distance, have the pretext for it reasonably."

5.15.6 οὐδεὶς ἂν ἦν σοὶ ὃς... "You had no one to...".

1.12.4 τὸ αὐτὸ οὖν τοῦτο καὶ ἐμοὶ γενέσθω, "Let me have the same treatment then,".

5.60.5 ταὐτὰ ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκείνου ἅπερ ἐμοί. "He had the same feelings towards the other as I had." Cf. 5.4.6, 5.60.7,9.

---

[33] In included clauses the possessed entity is sometimes in the accusative, the impersonal form in the infinitive. Cf. note 13.

1.11.3 τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἃ ἦν αὐτοῖς "the slaves that they had".
1.16.2 μετὰ ταῦτα ἔτυχε τῷ Φιλόνεῳ ἐν Πειραιεῖ ὄντα ἱερὰ Διὶ Κτησίῳ, "After that Philoneos happened to have in Piraeus a sacrifice to Zeus Ktesios,".

5.2.1 Parts

5.2.1.1 The possessed entity, (Part I) is, in finite clauses, always in the nominative, mostly indefinite[34]. Apart from unarticled nouns or οὐδείς we may also consider nominal groups with conditioned articles as indefinite, or at least as neutralizing definiteness. This is the case of 5.16.10 ὁ αὐτὸς κίνδυνος, 5.60.5 ταὐτὰ (αὐτὸς does not combine with an indefinite noun). Similar reasoning can be applied to 5.83.1-2 τὰ ἐναντία. (In 5.43.4 ἐν ᾧ μοι ὁ πᾶς κίνδυνος ἦν, ὁ πᾶς κίνδυνος seems equally indefinite, since unarticled πᾶς would mean "every", not "whole"; but the whole example seems to be better handled by the copula model, 4.1.1.)

5.2.1.2 The existential impersonal form is a part of speech by its own right, not a form of a verb. Its status is the same as that of the "there-is" form in the there-is clause (5.1.1.2), but the list of forms found in our corpus is not exactly the same. It is important to note that the impersonal form does not contain the category of PERSON, although it does contain NUMBER. The "third person ending", singular or plural, structurally means nothing; in this model it never commutes with other personal endings; it is irrelevant.

What "replaces" the personal endings is the dative expression, which enables the impersonal form to take on all three persons: ἔστι μοι, σοι, αὐτῷ, ἡμῖν, ὑμῖν, αὐτοῖς. This way of adding personal expressions to an impersonal form may be called VERBOID (Rosén, 1965: 82; 1975: 5.6), because of the functional parallelism

---

[34] Cf. Benveniste, 1960: 196 for parallel indefiniteness in French and in Latin.

with a personal verb. In this the possessional verboid resembles another sort of verboids, which we shall see later (§§6, 8, 9).

5.2.1.3 The dative expression is practically always pronominal, but 3 cases of substantive or participle were recorded. These are all definite:
1.16.2 ἔτυχε τῷ Φιλόνεῳ... ὄντα ἱερά.
5.26.9-10 τῷ ἀπάγοντι... ἡ πρόφασις ἐγίγνετο. See also 5.4.6.

5.2.2 Dependences

The parts I-II contract between them a dependence of number, which is unilateral: a plural impersonal form is always accompanied by a plural part I, whereas the contrary is not true: 1.11.3 τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἃ ἦν αὐτοῖς etc. Cf. §5.1.2.

5.2.3 Negation

The clause is negated by οὐ (5.37.6, 5.57.7., 5.58.5, 5.63.4) or its compounds οὐδὲ (5.57.1-2), οὐδεὶς (5.96.4-5) or οὔτε (5.26.9-10, 5.60.6, 5.60.7). Only indicative forms were recorded. Cf. §5.1.3.

5.2.4 Omission

Part I (the possessed) may be omitted when easily supplied from the context : 5.58. 5 (Ἀλλὰ χρήματα ἔμελλον λήψεσθαι ἀποκτείνας αὐτόν;) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ (sc. χρήματα).
5.63.4 (τῷ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν χρήματα,) ἐμοὶ δὲ ἦν (sc. χρήματα).

The impersonal form too may be supplied from the preceding clause:
5.60.5 (λέγω τοίνυν ὑμῖν ὅτι ταὐτὰ ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκεῖνον) ἅπερ ἐμοί (sc. ὑπῆρχεν).

No omission of the possessor was recorded. In fact, such an omission would have rendered the model irrecognizable: the other two parts would form then a "there-is" clause (at least when part

I is indefinite) or a verbal clause. The omission of the possessor is therefore impossible.

5.2.5 Presentation Type

One clear example of exclamation appears: 1.12.4 τὸ αὐτὸ οὖν τοῦτο καὶ ἐμοὶ γενέσθω "May the same occur to me (May I have the same)!". All the other are assertions, some of them possibly slightly emotional. Cf. 5.4.6, 5.16.10, 5.26.9-10.

5.2.6 Word Order

5.2.6.1 Normal word order in unnegated, unmarked clauses follows the one presented above, §5.2: Possessed -- impersonal form -- possessor, e.g. 5.15.6 οὐδεὶς ἂν ἦν σοι, ὃς... etc. But the possessor appears often in clause-beginning, when there is a contrast with another subject (mostly personal pronouns) standing in two neighbouring clauses: 5.16.10 (εἰ <u>ὑμῖν μὲν</u>... κατείργασται ἃ βούλεσθε,) <u>ἐμοὶ δ'</u>... ὁ αὐτὸς κίνδυνος ὑπολείπεται. See also 1.11.3, 5.26.9-10, 5.57.7, 5.96.4-5.

Still the possessor can be inserted between the other two, apparently when the possessed is stressed: 5.24.6 ΠΛΟΥΣ τε <u>ἡμῖν</u> ἐγίγνετο, 5.60.7 οὔτε ΚΙΝΔΥΝΟΣ <u>αὐτῷ</u> ὑπῆρχεν οὐδείς. See also 5.85.6. However, in 1.12.4 the possessor itself is stressed: τὸ αὐτὸ οὖν τοῦτο καὶ ΕΜΟΙ γενέσθω.

Substantive and attributive negatives (οὐδεὶς, οὐδεμία) or negative connectives (οὐδὲ, οὔτε) do not affect word order:
5.96.4-5 καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδεὶς λόγος ἔσται
5.57.1-2 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχθρα οὐδεμία ἦν ἐμοὶ κἀκείνῳ. See also 5.15.6, 5.26.9-10, 5.60.6, 5.60.7.

Occasional shifts occur, due to "attraction" of a weak word to a (presumably) more strongly stressed one: 5.85.6 ἀγὼν <u>μοι</u> νόμιμος ὑπολείπεται. Also: 6.60.7.

5.2.6.2 In negated clauses, the negative οὐ attracts, as it were, the impersonal form closer towards clause-beginning:

5.57.7 ἐμοὶ δὲ κἀκείνῳ ΟΥΚ ἦν ἔχθρα οὐδεμία.
5.37.6 ΟΥΚ ἦν αὐτῷ τιμωρὸς οὐδείς. Cf. also: 5.63.4.

5.2.6.3 Few exceptions to the above orders occur. In 1.14.3 καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ παλλακή, ἣν..., παλλακή seems to be at the end of its clause because of the relative clause belonging to it.

In one example the impersonal form itself seems to be more firmly stressed, which might have been the reason for a clause-beginning position:
1.16.2 μετὰ ταῦτα ἔτυχε τῷ Φιλόνεῳ ἐν Πειραιεῖ ὄντα ἱερά.

5.2.7 Discussion

The function (*signifié*) of the model is to express POSSESSION, i.e. the belonging of something (the possessed) to someone (the possessor). The normal English translation of such a clause would be by means of *to have*.

This raises at once the question of the status of the verb ἔχω, normally rendered "to have" in dictionaries and translations. Now, in the present corpus, ἔχω does not normally translate "to have", but is better rendered, when transitive, by "keep", "contain", "hold", "occupy", "get", rarely "have"[35]. It may be said that the relation of ἔχω to its object is not possession; it is a temporary state of "keeping", "holding" or "occupying". The relation is more concrete, more corporeal than the one between the possessed and the verboid "there-is-to" in our present model. The difference may be seen in the following examples, where a "there-is" model (which is very close to the present one) neighbours ἔχω: 1.14.1 Ὑπερῷόν τι ἦν τῆς ἡμετέρας οἰκίας, ὃ εἶχε Φιλόνεως ὁπότ' ἐν ἄστει διατρίβοι, "*There was* an attic of our house, which Ph. *occupied* whenever he stayed in town,"; 5.69.8 ... αἰτίαν ποτὲ σχόντες οὐκ οὖσαν, ... οἱ Ἑλληνοταμίαι... "the Hellenotamiae, at a certain time, *carrying* (imposed with) a charge which did not really *exist*".

---

[35] For a discussion of the expression of "have" through ἔστι μοι, *est mihi* etc. see Benveniste, 1960.

Certain expressions with ἔχω such as συγγνώμην ἔχειν "have mercy", which has no corresponding verboid construction, may leave the impression of a complementary distribution of the different possessed objects between the verb and the verboid. But a contrasting of all the examples in Antiphon (Cleef, 1895: s.v. ἔχω, ἔστι (9)) produces two lists of objects which differ, but which present nevertheless some overlapping in the kind of the objects, once even in the actual noun (ἐλπίς). Also, the two lists contain both definite and indefinite objects. The difference must therefore be due to the divergence in meaning between the verb and the verboid.

The ἔχω objects list contains mostly nouns denoting physical or mental states, thoughts or feelings, which are "held" or "carried": γνώμην "mind, opinion", πρόφασιν "motive", τέλος "effectiveness", συγγνώμην "mercy", δύναμιν "potential", ἀνάγκην "legal constraint" ἐλπίδα "hope", πρόνοιαν "premeditation"; to these may be added αἰτίαν "responsibility, accusation", δίκην "punishment", ἐπίχειρα "reward", μίασμα "impurity". Few objects are concrete: ὑπερῷον (see above), ἱμάτια, νῆσον (in Fragm. 50) αὐτὸν (5.30.3, of keeping a man in prison).

The verboid ἔστι list shows all kind of possessions: παλλακή, δοῦλοι, ἀνδράποδα, ἐξουσία, χρήματα, μάρτυρες, τιμωρός "avenger", οὐδείς, ἔτη, κίνδυνος, τὰ ἐναντία, and few inner or outer feelings: ἔχθρα, ἐλπίς, ἔλεγχος.

The transition from ἔστι μοι to ἔχω which is complete in later texts, seems to have originated in syntactic "transformations" of ἔστι μοι, where a transitive verb came in more handy: 5.18.1-4 (Τούτοις ἦν τοῦτο συμφέρον... ἀπαρασκεύαστον γενέσθαι με,... ἔπειτα κακοπαθεῖν τῷ σώματι,) τούς τε φίλους προθυμοτέρους <u>ἔχειν</u> τοὺς ἐμαυτοῦ τούτοις τὰ ψευδῆ μαρτυρεῖν ἢ ἐμοὶ τἀληθῆ. "(This helped them... my becoming unprepared,... then in suffering bodily,) and in *having* my friends more ready to testify lies for those people than the truth for me." We have also recorded a case of contamination between the two models: 5.60.1-2 αὐτῷ μοι πρόφασιν οὐδεμίαν ἔχει ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἄνδρα (sic codd.). The meaning is no doubt "I myself had no motive at all to kill the man" but the construction is mixed.

All the above discussion naturally applies only to transitive cases of ἔχω. Intransitive uses do not contrast with the present model.

THE TWO "THERE-IS" MODELS

Differing features of the existence model as opposed to the possession one (mainly definiteness of the existing entity) have made us treat them separately till now. Still, these models possess a formal affinity which cannot be ignored and their functions too seem to be reducible to a common one. In other words, the contents expressed e.g. in English in two distinct ways, *have* vs. *there is*, are rendered in Greek in essentially one pattern.

What we mean is that the "there-is" clause can be viewed as a sub-type of the possession model, only having no personal element in the dative. The clause is then truly impersonal: It expresses the mere being-there of the nominative noun-phrase, possessed by no specific "person", which means by no one and by everyone at the same time. The idiomatic English translation would be "there is..." (French *il y a*, German *es gibt*, etc.); this rendering obliterates the connexion of the clause with the possession model, which we render by "to have". But there can be found another translation, less idiomatic, it is true, but which has the advantage of keeping the above connexion; instead of "there is" we can say "one has..." (Fr. *on a...*, Ger. *man hat...*), e.g. 5.87.10 ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ τιμωρήσων, "When one has no avenger" (= "When there is no avenger"), etc.

It is easy to see that the modern languages cited have a specific "neutral" pronoun (*one*, *on*, *man*) for which the Greek has ZERO. The term IMPERSONAL, which in Greek suits so well the lack of a (relevant) personal ending or personal expression, has often been applied to these neutral pronouns *one*, *on*, *man*, etc. We find that a better term for them would be FOURTH PERSON[36], as these pronouns represent no less than an additional, neutral person,

---

[36] Prof. H.B. Rosén has coined the term SEVENTH PERSON, meaning of course SEVENTH ENDING or SEVENTH PRONOUN added to the usual six in IE languages. I owe the whole idea to some of his lectures and seminars in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

added to the paradigm of *I*, *you*, *he-she-it*, etc. Now in Greek too it will be convenient to use FOURTH PERSON, as a *signifié* category, having for *signifiant*, in the present model, a zero expression. The reason is that elsewhere in Greek, e.g. in the verbal model, the same *signifié* category is expressed not by Ø, but by the 3rd pers. pl. of the verb (λέγουσιν, φασί), the 2nd pers. sgl. (λέγεις) or by the "impersonal passive" (λέγεται, which may itself contain a zero. Cf. below 8.4.4.4). We may therefore say that in the present model the possessor is expressed by a personal expression in the dative and the clause is then translatable by "I have", "you have", etc.; Ø-possessor expresses the fourth person and the clause thus becomes "one has" or "there is".

We shall see below that the idea of a zero person may be helpful in other models too, clarifying a few crucial problems. (See 6.4.1, 6.7.3).

NORMATIVE STATEMENT CLAUSE

I	II	III
Impersonal-Innumeral Form	*Dative Nominal*	*Nominalization*
Third person singular[37] verb	Noun	Infinitive clause
Neuter Singular Adjective, or Participle, or Singular Noun, (+ ἐστί)	Personal pronoun	ὅτι + clause
Various expressions		

Examples:

1.7.5 ἐγχωρεῖ (I) αὐτῷ (II) περὶ τούτων εἰδέναι (III) "He can know about these".

1.8.2 οὐχ οἷον τ᾽ ἦν (I) αὐτῇ (II) σωθῆναι (III) "It was not possible for her to be acquitted".

1.10.6 ἀλλ᾽ ἐξήρκει (I) μοι (II) τοῖς ἐν τῷ γραμματείῳ χρῆσθαι (III). "It was sufficient for me to use the written documents".

1.6.2 (bis) Ἐν οἷς μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ (II) ἐξουσία ἦν (I) σαφῶς εἰδέναι

---

[37] In included clauses the infinitive or the participle of these verbs is found.

(III)... οὐκ ἠθέλησεν· ἐν οἷς δ' οὐκ ἦν (I) πυθέσθαι (III), τοῦτο αὐτὸ προὐθυμήθη. "For where there was a possibility for him to know, he was not willing; but where it was not feasible to get the information, there he insisted."

5.13.3-4 (bis) καίτοι ἐμοὶ (II) εἰ μηδὲν διέφερε (I) στέρεσθαι (III) τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως, ἴσον ἦν (I) μοι (II) καὶ... μὴ ἐλθεῖν (III), "However, if it did not matter to me to be deprived of this city, it was legally possible for me not to come too,".

5.60.2 δεῖ (I) δέ με καὶ ὑπὲρ Λυκίνου ἀπολογήσασθαι (III), "I need to set up a defence for Lykinos too,".

5.48.6 Εἴπερ γὰρ καὶ μαρτυρεῖν (III) ἔξεστι (I) δούλῳ (II) "For if indeed it is permitted for a slave to bear witness".

5.61.2 ἐξὸν (I) γὰρ αὐτῷ (II)... ἀπολέσαι (III) αὐτόν,... οὐκ ἠξίωσεν, "for when he could destroy him... he did not want to,".

5.76.11 πρὸς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῷ (II) ἀδυνάτως εἶχεν (I) ἰσχυρίζεσθαι (III). "It was impossible for him to oppose the city."

5.16.5 Ὥστε... ἐξεῖναι (I) σοι (II) λέγειν (III) "So... that it was possible for you to say...". Etc.

6.1 Parts

6.1.1 Part I expressions of this model are not uniform, although they share two formal features: they do not possess the categories of person or number.

6.1.1.1 Some of these are forms resembling third person singular verbs (or, when syntactically necessary, the infinitive or participle of such a verb): δεῖ, διαφέρει, δοκεῖ, ἐγγίγνεται, ἐγχωρεῖ, ἐξαρκεῖ, ἔξεστι, ἔστι, προσήκει, ὑπάρχει, χρή (for complete documentation see Cleef, 1895 svv.). These forms are conjugated for tense and mood, but do not change their third person singular ending; person and number are accordingly structurally irrelevant: we have here a distinct "part of speech", which may be called IMPERSONAL-INNUMERAL FORM (IIF), differing from the "there is" forms only with respect to "number" (cf. §5). These forms resemble, as mentioned, verbs; moreover, some of them relate "etymologically" to existing verbs: δέομαι, διαφέρω, δοκῶ, ἐγχωρέω,

(? 5.29.6). Ἔστι relates to the frequent copula verb or to the impersonal "there is" form (cf. §§4,5. For ἔστι examples see 1.6.6, 5.50.1-2, 5.73.6, 5 .73. 7-8, 5.94.4). Other forms are not connected with existing verbs.

6.1.1.2 The IIF may also be a neuter singular adjective or participle in the nominative: ἀγαθόν 5.71.3, ἀνοσιώτερον 1.5.4, ἄξιον 1.26.7 etc., βέλτιον 1.17.6, δεδειγμένον 5.80.4, δεινόν 1.12.5-6, δικαιότερον 1.25.1 etc., οὐ δίκαιον 5.5.5, εἰκός 1.11.8, etc., ἔλαττον 5.91.7, ἴσον 5.13.4 etc., κάλλιστον 1.16.4, μέγα 5.72.4, οἷόν τε 5.53.6 etc., πλέον 5.44.5, ῥᾷστον 5.95.1, χαλεπόν 5.65.5-6, or a singular noun in the nominative (ἁμαρτία καὶ ἀσέβεια 5.88.8, ἀνάγκη 5.6.1 etc., ἐξουσία 1.6.2, μακρότερος λόγος 1.18.2). We shall group both adjectives and nouns under the term *nomen*.

What is interesting is that some of these may figure with or without ἐστί, apparently with no change in their function. This trait shows the essentially non-verbal nature of the model, for no verb is obligatory as IIF. It proves further that verb-resembling forms need not have relevant verbal categories (see above 6.1.1.1).

Forms with and without ἐστί are thus distributed: ἐστί is recorded in all tenses outside the present indicative. In that tense, however, the presence of ἐστί seems mostly limited to clauses where the *nomen* is not at clause-beginning. When opening the clause, or separated from the beginning just by a connective or interrogative particle (sometimes by an adverbial) the *nomen* always stands alone. Clause beginning:

5.6.1 <u>Ἀνάγκη</u> δὲ κινδυνεύοντα... καὶ πού τι καὶ ἐξαμαρτεῖν. "The one who is in danger... must also somewhere make a mistake." See also 5.3.7, 5.87.3, 5.87.8-9; not quite in clause beginning: 5.6.2.

Elsewhere:

5.6.5 Ταῦτ' οὖν ἔκπληξιν πολλὴν παρέχειν <u>ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ</u> τῷ κινδυνεύοντι. "This must cause a great confusion to the one in danger."

Clause beginning:

5.4.4 εἰκὸς γὰρ... τὴν ἀκρόασιν ὑπάρχειν... "For it is fit... that there be listening...".

Elsewhere:
1.26.7 πῶς οὖν ταύτην ἐλεεῖν ἄξιόν ἐστιν... "Now how can it be worthwhile to pity her...". See also 5.50.6, 5.73.2-3.

However, quite a few examples occur, where there is no ἐστί, even if the *nomen* does not stand at the beginning:
1.11.8 ἐμοὶ δήπου εἰκὸς ταὐτὰ ταῦτα τεκμήρια εἶναι "it is for me that these are fit to be evidence". See also 1.6.3-4, 1.24.4, 1.25.2, 5.6.2, 5.65.5-6, 5.95.1.

The appearance of ἐστί in some of the examples makes them rather similar to copula clause, with infinitives as subjects:
1.5.4 (ἐγὼ δ' ἡγοῦμαι) πολὺ ἀνοσιώτερον εἶναι ἀφεῖναι... τὴν τιμωρίαν, "(I think) it is much more unhallowed to leave aside... the revenge,". (Cf. with an articled infinitive, the copula clause in 5.91.2.) In the following we might have seen either normative statement clauses one within the other, or a copula clause included within a normative statement:
1.16.4 Κάλλιστον οὖν ἐδόκει εἶναι τῷ Φιλόνεῳ... ἅμα μὲν προπέμψαι ... ἅμα δὲ ἑστιᾶσαι ἐκεῖνον. "It seemed best to Ph. to both accompany... and... feed him." See also 1.12.5-6, 1.17.5, 5.89.1-2, 5.91.5-7. However, there is one important trait here which does not permit classifying these examples as copula-clauses: their infinitive is not articled, whereas the subject of a copula should be definite (§4.1). They were accordingly classified as normative statements.

6.1.1.3 The last sub-paradigm pertaining to the IIF is a mixed one: ἔν (τινί) ἐστι, ἐπί (τινί) ἐστι, and ἔχει preceded by adverbs: καλῶς, εὐρόπως (5.76.8-9, cf. varr. lectt.), ἀδυνάτως, ἀναγκαίως. What brings these together is the constant combination of a third-person-singular form (ἐστί, ἔχει) with an essentially adverbial expression: unlike the preceding sub-paradigms (6.1.1.1, 6.1.1.2) neither the "third person singular" form nor the *nomen* can stand alone. As with the first sub-paradigm, due to the permanent third-person-singular ending, no relevant categories of person or number are present.
5.76.8-9 Οὔτε γὰρ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν εὐρόπως εἶχεν αὐτῷ· "Nor was it easy for him to leave the city;". See also 1.1.5, 5.67.3-4,

5.67.11.

Slightly different are ἐπί (τινί) ἐστι and ἔν (τινί) ἐστι: consisting of a prepositional phrase and a form of εἰμί, they could easily be classified as copula clauses, with an infinitive as "subject":

5.52.5 ὅτε ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἦν τοῦτο εἰς τὴν Αἶνον ἀπάγειν ἅμα ἐμοί, τοῦτο δὲ εἰς τὴν ἤπειρον διαβιβάσαι, "When it depended on me either to take <them> away to Aenos with me, or to transfer <them> to the continent,". See also 5.31.4-5, 5.76.7-8. The same holds good for ἐν phrases: 1.22.7 ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι τοῦτ' ὀρθῶς διαγνῶναι, "It rests with you to diagnose this rightly,". See also 1.31.2, 5.73.7-8. But the axiomatic, normative character of these clauses, together with the fact that the infinitive here is not articled (cf. §4.1), decide for the present model.

6.1.2 Part II expressions are rarely nouns or participles, either articled or not: 1.31.3 τοῖς θεοῖς, 5.65.5-6 τῷ εἰργασμένῳ, 1.16.4 τῷ Φιλόνεῳ, 5.47.7 πόλει. Mostly they consist of personal pronouns of all persons.

6.1.3 Part III is in the great majority of the examples an infinitive phrase, always without article.

6.1.3.1 Most of these phrases consist of an *accusativus cum infinitivo*: 1.6.3-4 Πῶς οὖν περὶ τούτων... αὐτὸν εἰκὸς εἰδέναι; "How then is it fit,... for him to know about these things?". Etc.

6.1.3.2 Some of the infinitive phrases are without an accusative "subject".

5.6.2 Οὐ γὰρ μόνον τῶν λεγομένων ἀνάγκη ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων. "One should bear in mind not only what is said, but also what will be." (See also 5.19.6, 5.45.5, 5.50.4, 5.50.6, 5.56.3, 5.64.7, 5.71.3, 5.82.1, 5.87.8-9, 5.91.1, 5.91.4, 5.95.1.) This example is one of the cases of a "fourth person" ("one"; cf. §§5.3, 6.4.1): neither the accusative subject of the infinitive nor the person in the dative (part II) are specified. The result is a non-personal maxim, addressed to no one in particular.

No accusative subject in the infinitive phrase is almost the rule when the present model does contain a part II (a dative); for

when the dative refers to the same person as the eventual accusative subject of the infinitive-phrase, this accusative is not expressed: 1.8.2 οὐχ οἷόν τ' ἦν αὐτῇ σωθῆναι "She could not be acquitted".
5.14.3-4 Ὑπάρχει μέν γε αὐτοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις εἶναι "They have the advantage of being the oldest". Etc.

6.1.3.3 There are examples, however, where both the dative and the accusative are recorded, referring to different persons: 5.31.4 ἐπὶ τούτοις ἦν παύσασθαι κακοῦμενον αὐτόν, "It rested with *them* that *he* stops being tortured,".
1.12.6 δεινὸν δ' ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ εἶναι εἰ ὑμᾶς μὲν ζητοῦσιν αἰτεῖσθαι ... "It seems to *me* terrible *that they try to ask you...*" (in this case the *acc. c. inf.* is a copula clause, δεινὸν (II)... εἶναι (III) εἰ... (I), with a second accusative, the predicative δεινόν). See also 1.16.4, 1.17.6, 5.23.6.

A difficult case which may be relevant here is the status of τοι (=σοι?) in clauses like 5.91.11-12 ἢ καὶ πάνυ τοι χρῆν τούς γε ἐξαπατῶντας ἀπολωλέναι "Indeed the crooks should have been condemned to death" or perhaps "It was indeed necessary for you (τοι) that the crooks be condemned to death". Here τοι may play the role of an "impersonal" ("everyone") dative. See also 5.48.9, 5.72.4, 5.95.1.

6.2 Dependences

No dependences hold between the parts.

This fact is one of the reasons why no attempt has been made to determine whether part III (the infinitive phrase) is "subject" or "object" of part I (IIF): since the unarticled infinitive has no category of number, person or case, there is no dependence of the kind recorded between "subject" and other parts in other models. Therefore there seems to be no point in trying this kind of labelling, even though experience with the verbal model may cause the subjective need to identify a "subject".

6.3. Negation

6.3.1 Normal negation of the model is by οὐ or its compounds οὐδὲ, οὔκουν, οὐκέτι:
5.90.7-8 ὑμῖν... ἀπολέσαι... οὐδὲ βουλεύσασθαι ἔτι περὶ ἐμοῦ ἐγχωρεῖ. "There is no possibility for you, having condemned me, to consider further my case."
5.5.5 Οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον... ἔργῳ ἁμαρτόντα διὰ ῥήματα σωθῆναι, "For it is not just for one who actually sinned to be acquitted by the force of words,". See also 1.8.2, 1.13.1, 5.14.8, 5.19.6, 5.47.7, 5.50.1-2, 5.53.5-6, 5.56.3, 5.67.3-4, (5.73.7-8?), 5.76.7-8.

Clause parts (phrases) may be negated by οὐ, without negating the clause as a whole: 5.6.2 Οὐ γὰρ μόνον τῶν λεγομένων ἀνάγκη ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων. "For one must bear in mind not only what is said but also what will be."

6.3.2 Clauses which are included in other clauses, be it as a conditional clause or as an infinitive clause, are negated by μὴ or its compounds:
5.13.3-4 ἐμοὶ εἰ μηδὲν διέφερε στέρεσθαι τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως, "Had it mattered nothing to me to be deprived of this city,".
5.17.4 ὥστε τοῦτο μὴ ἐγγενέσθαι μοι ποιῆσαι. "So that I did not come around to do it." See also 5.46.7.

6.4 Omissions

6.4.1 A frequent and most important omission is that of part II, the dative nominal. As a matter of fact, out of 106 safe examples, only 29 contained such a dative. But non-occurrence of the dative does not mean omission of the category it represents. It is true that it constitutes the only personal expression in the present model: the innumeral impersonal forms build a kind of a "verboid" personal inflection with the help of the dative. Thus 1.8.2 οἷόν τ' ἦν αὐτῇ is "it was possible for her" or, taken personally, "she could". Now the appearance of a zero-dative expression in the model therefore makes it completely "impersonal", in the sense that

its content is not attributed to any specific person, "I", "you" or "he"; it is thus attributed to everyone and to no special one at the same time. We shall say that the zero dative expresses the FOURTH PERSON, often translated by "one" (see similar discussion above 5.3). Thus 5.56.3 οἷόν τ' ἦν is "it was possible" or, personally, "one could".

For the relations between dative-omission and omission of a part of the infinitive phrase (part III) cf. above 6.1.3.2, 6.1.3.3.

6.4.2 A possible omission of one half of part I (impersonal-innumeral form) is 1.6.5 (ἐν οἷς μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἦν σαφῶς εἰδέναι... οὐκ ἠθέλησεν) ἐν οἷς δ' οὐκ ἦν <ἐξουσία> πυθέσθαι, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ προὐθυμήθη. "(Where he was able to know clearly... he was not willing;) but where there was no possibility to inquire, he insisted." I have preferred to count ἦν as an independent part I expression, instead of supplying ἐξουσία. (Other independent ἐστὶ instances are 5.50.1-2, 5.94.4, perhaps also 5.73.6, 5.73.7-8.)

6.4.3 The infinitive phrase may be omitted, even if the case is rare. 1.17.2 (ἐπειδὴ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Πειραιεῖ,) οἷον εἰκὸς <θύειν> ἔθυεν. "(Once they were in Piraeus) he sacrificed, as one should <sacrifice>." See also 1.18.3.

6.5 Presentation Type

6.5.1 The present model is characteristically an assertive clause, stating some grave normative judgement about a situation.

6.5.2 However, an imperative form of part I may hint at an exclamative nature: 5.66.3-4 ἀλλ' <u>ἐξαρκείτω</u> μοι ἐμαυτὸν ἀναίτιον ἀποδεῖξαι τοῦ πράγματος. "Let it suffice for me to show myself not responsible of the affair." No other examples were recorded.

6.5.3 Some questions occur: 1.7.6 (=1.6.3 in some editions) πῶς οὖν περὶ τούτων, ὦ δικάζοντες, αὐτὸν εἰκὸς εἰδέναι, (ὧν γε τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ εἴληφε); "How then is it probable that he knows about these,

judges, (of which he did not seek the truth)?". See also 1.7.5, 1.26.7.

1.25.2 καὶ πότερον δικαιότερον οἰκτεῖραι μᾶλλον τὸν τεθνεῶτα ἢ τὴν ἀποκτείνασαν; "And is it just to pity the murdered rather than the murderess?".

5.55.1 ποτέρῳ χρὴ πιστεῦσαι; "Whom should one believe?".

6.6 Word Order

Normal word-order is in general I - II - III, as presented above, §6. But part II (dative) often precedes the rest (it is, as shown in 6.4.1, often omitted altogether). Part I precedes part III almost universally. Still, cases like 1.27.2 ἐλεεῖν (III) ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις παθήμασι μᾶλλον προσήκει (I) ἢ τοῖς ἑκουσίοις, show that too can be reversed. Generally, "deviations" from what we established as normal order seem to follow the rule that a Given precedes a New, so that positions of the parts may vary with various Given-New constellations. This is what is often called "free word order", an erroneus appellation, since position here is relevant to clause bipartition (see §0.2, end). The only correct sense of *free* in this context may therefore be that of "relevant, unconditioned".

6.7 Discussion

6.7.1 The function of the present model is to express statements mostly heavy with value judgements in the form of an objective assertion.

The objective appearance is arrived at by the use of the impersonal-innumeral form, which expresses what is necessary, worthy, just, allowed, important, possible, difficult, easy, clear, sufficient, different etc. This kind of statement reminds one of religious imperatives on the one hand and of statements about the weather on the other: both are, or aspire to be, unshakable. Incidentally, no "atmospherical impersonals" like ὕει, βροντᾷ etc.

(Schwyzer, 1950: 621,3) are recorded in our corpus (or in Antiphon in general). This seems to be due to the subject-matter of the text. Perhaps because of a similar reason, the present model is rather frequent (some 110 examples). This does not mean that it "replaces" in any sense the "atmospherical model" which other Greek Corpora will have. At the same time it cannot be said that the present corpus "lacks" one of the Greek clause-models: precisely this "lack" tells us something about the specific character of the corpus. (For a model somewhat similar to the atmospherical one cf. below 7.)

6.7.2 Formally, the present model has some affinities with some of the previous ones: the non-verbal clause (e.g. εἰκὸς + infinitive), or the copula clause (εἰκός ἐστι + infinitive); but the closest resemblance is with the two varieties of the "there is" clause (5.1, 5.2): an example like 5.50.1-2 οὐκ <u>ἦν</u>... ὥσπερ τὸν ἕτερον πεῖσαι "It was not feasible... to convince <him> like the other one" differs from a "there is" clause only in the infinitive (which is thus responsible for the translation "is feasible", not "there-is");

6.7.3 The occurrence vs. omission of the dative expression (cf. 6.4.1) might have led us to establish two distinct (sub-) models (somewhat in parallel to the "there-is" submodels): with and without a personal element in the dative. This could have been strengthened by the following: many "third person singular" forms, like δεῖ, χρή, προσήκει never take a dative in our corpus. What seems to add to them a personal element is the accusative subject of the infinitive phrase:

5.20.6 (Συνέπλευσε δὲ τά τε ἀνδράποδα) ἃ ἔδει <u>αὐτὸν</u> ἀπολῦσαι, "(Also sailed the slaves) whom it was necessary *for him* to set free,".

5.14.8 Ὥστε οὐ δεῖ <u>ὑμᾶς</u>... τοὺς νόμους καταμανθάνειν... "So that it is not necessary *for you*... to examine the laws..." etc.

It should be remembered, however, that some part I expressions do occur, with the same function meaning, either with or without a part II dative: εἰκός, ἐγχωρεῖ, ἔξεστι, οἷόν τ' ἐστι, καλῶς ἔχει. As for the others (δεῖ etc.) it seems better too, on the force of external evidence, to assign them to the same unique model: Liddell-Scott-Jones, 1940 s.v. δεῖ (I), know of the construction of this form with

both infinitive (with an accusative) and personal dative, e.g. Xen. Anab. 3.4.35: (ἐάν τε τις θόρυβος γίγνηται,) δεῖ (I) ἐπισάξαι τὸν ἵππον (III) Πέρσῃ ἀνδρί (II) "(And when there is some noise,) a Persian man has to saddle his horse". Personal dative, then, is not impossible with δεῖ. We prefer therefore to analyse 5.14.8 οὐ δεῖ ὑμᾶς... καταμανθάνειν as constructed with a zero dative, meaning "fourth person" (cf. 6.4.1) expression: "It is not necessary", "One does not have to", then render the infinitive phrase "for you to examine".

6.7.4 A few examples present what might be considered a (pro)nominal "subject" for the impersonal-innumeral form, apart from the infinitive phrase (which may at will be taken as "subject" of that form, see 6.2). But a closer examination shows this subject to be unreal. In 5.47.7 a neuter relative pronoun, ὅ, stands in EXTRAPOSITION to the infinitive, a thing which may indicate the nominal character of the infinitive, but does not change the number or identity of the parts: (Νῦν δὲ αὐτοί... ἀπεκτείνατε) ὃ οὐδὲ πόλει ἔξεστιν, ἄνευ Ἀθηναίων οὐδένα θανάτῳ ζημιῶσαι. "(Now you yourselves killed <him>); *which* is not even possible for a town, *to punish* with death someone without the Athenians."

The only other "personal subject" would be μηδὲν: 5.13.3 Καίτοι ἐμοὶ εἰ μηδὲν διέφερε στέρεσθαι τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως,... "Nevertheless, had it mattered nothing to me to be deprived of this city...". But μηδὲν is better considered a negative adverb here, as is shown by an equivalent οὐδὲν in 5.53.5-6 οὐδὲν ἔδει κρύπτειν αὐτά "There was no need to hide these things", not "Nothing was necessary to hide these things". See also 5.66.6, 5.70.6[38].

---

[38] For εἴ τι δέοι τῷ χορῷ (6.12.7, out of our corpus) see §7 below (note 40).

STATE-OF-THINGS CLAUSE

I	II
Impersonal-Innumeral Form	*Dative Nominal*

The examples recorded:

1.1.2 (Νέος μὲν καὶ ἄπειρος δικῶν ἔγωγε ἔτι) δεινῶς δὲ καὶ ἀπόρως ἔχει (I) μοι (II) περὶ τοῦ πράγματος, "(I am still young and inexperienced in courts of law,) and I feel terribly and at a loss about the affair,".

5.68.4-5 (εἰ οὖν τις ἠξίου τοὺς συνόντας,... ἐνόχους εἶναι τῷ φόνῳ,) οὐκ ἂν καλῶς εἶχε (I) τοῖς συνοῦσιν (II). "(Had someone demanded that his companions... would be guilty of the murder,) the companions would feel very badly."

5.67.3-4 οὔκουν ἂν καλῶς ἔχοι (I), (εἰ... δέοι τὰς αἰτίας ὑποσχεῖν τοὺς συγγενομένους). "It would not be well (if those present would be forced to bear the charges)."

5.35.1-2 οὐ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ χρεία ἦν (I) αὐτοῖς (II), ἀλλὰ τῶν λόγων. "It was not his body that they needed, but the things he said."

5.91.10 τισιν (II) ὑμῶν καὶ μετεμέλησεν (I) ἀπολωλεκόσι "Some of you

have already repented of having condemned to death".
5.91.11 ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐξαπατηθεῖσι (II) μετεμέλησεν (I), "You, when misled, felt repentance,".

A possible example, even though rather close to the normative-statement clause, is the following:
1.7.6 τί ποτε ἀπολογήσεται μέλει (I) μοι (II) (μέλλει codd., corr. Blass). "I am intrigued, what on earth is he going to say in defence"[39].

7.1 Part I is in three examples ἔχει preceded by an adverb: καλῶς, δεινῶς, ἀπόρως[40]. In another we have a compound part made up of χρεία with ἐστί. Finally there are three "third person" examples: μέλει (once), μεταμέλει (twice). The forms admissible in this part resemble much those of the previous model; they are impersonal and innumeral too.

7.2 No dependences hold between the parts.

7.3 Negation is by οὐ (5.68.4-5), οὔκουν (5.67.3-4).

7.4 The dative pronoun is omitted in 5.67.3-4 οὔκουν ἂν καλῶς ἔχοι, εἰ... This Ø stands for a "neuter person" (one, they) which we call the FOURTH PERSON, as in the "there is" clause (§5.3) or in the normative statement clause (§6.4.1). A (substantivized) participial phrase corresponding to this agentless example is 5.14.7 τὰ μὴ καλῶς ἔχοντα "What is not good".

7.5 Only assertive clauses were recorded.

7.6 Word order is mostly I-II, but may be reversed, apparently

---

[39] An interesting example from outside our corpus is 6.12.7 εἴ τι δέοι τῷ χορῷ "if the chorus needs anything". Here δέοι does not have its "normative" force as in §6 above. As for τι, it need not be taken as subject for δέοι but as an adverbial: see §§6.7.4 and 9.1.

[40] The construction ἔχω with adverb is of course not limited to the present model. We have cited 5.7.4 ὁσίως ἔχουσα in the non-verbal clause, and phrases like καλῶς or ἀδυνάτως ἔχει in 6.1.1.3. It is the model which makes the difference between these kinds of "intransitive ἔχω".

to serve Given-New bipartition.

7.7 The present model is one of the clauses containing impersonal or impersonal-innumeral parts. It resembles mainly the normative statement clause, but differs from it in that it does not contain an infinitive, thereby consisting of two parts, rather than three, and carrying a different function.

The function of the model reminds one of "atmospherical verbs" (better: clauses) as ὕει, βροντᾷ etc. (Schwyzer, 1950: 621, 3) not found in our corpus. It might be that, had such clauses been found, they would have had to be treated in the frame of the present model, which expresses a state of things, either concerning someone in particular (part II) or belonging to everyone (zero part II). Therefore, when part II is not omitted, it serves as a personal-numeral element for the impersonal-innumeral part I. Together they might be considered a "verboid" construction, containing all verbal categories with a non-verbal morphology (for a somewhat different view of verboids see now Rosén, 1975: §5.5). Even with an omitted part II the clause may be said to have a personal element, a zero, expressing the "fourth person". The model is not unlike the German sensation-model *Mir ist kalt*, or, with a fourth person form *Es ist kalt*.

PASSIVE VERBAL CLAUSE

Subject	*Verb*	*Agent*	*Instrument*
Nominative[41]:	Verb[41] with "passive" ending	ὑπό + genitive nominal	Dative nominal
noun	Verb with "active" ending	παρά + genitive nominal	διά + accusative nominal
articled participle		genitive nominal	ἐξ + genitive nominal
personal pronoun			ἐν + dative nominal
relative pronoun	Verb in perfect with "passive" ending	dative nominal	
τί			

8.1 Parts

8.1.1 The verb.

8.1.1.1 The "Passive ending" verbs found in the present model do not all have the same status. Most of them have a clear "passive

---

[41] In some included clauses the subject is in the accusative, the verb in the participle, in the same case as its subject.

meaning", i.e., they suppose the intervention of at least one participant beside the subject, for the achievement of the action or state denoted by the verb. This "passive meaning" is in fact connected with the existence of a corresponding "active" ending form of the same verb (cf. ἀναγκάζομαι 5.41.4-5, πείθομαι 5.33.5, ζητοῦμαι 5.23.5, etc.).

Other verbs are normally intransitives, having an "active" counterpart (cf. ἀπόλλυμαι 1.25.8) or not (cf. γίγνομαι 5.21.6). Still other "passive ending" forms, either having a corresponding "active" form (cf. πεποίηται 5.77.5) or not (cf. εἴργαστο 5.52.4) may be found in the active model as transitive verbs.

Consequently, it is not the formal "passive" ending which makes the passive function or passive meaning - it is the model.

8.1.1.2 "Greek *apothnēskei* is just as active when we render it 'is killed' (thus when it is followed by *hupo* 'by') as when we simply say 'dies'", says Jespersen (1924: 165. The same view in Schwyzer, 1959: 226,2 and 237). The statement is naturally true as far as active ENDINGS are concerned; it is wrong concerning the verb's syntactic behaviour and consequent meaning. The passive clause model admits of a few active-ending verbs, which, once in the model, have to be understood (and translated) "passively". (Thus also Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §373, 5, and, with some reserve, Lyons, 1968: 376ff.):

ἀποθνῄσκω "be killed, die": 5.44.2-3 ὑπὸ δὲ ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς <u>ἀποθνῄσκων</u> οὔτε ἀνέκραγεν... "being killed by one single man he did not even cry out...". See also 1.22.6, 1.22.7, 5.39.4-5, 5.48.3, 5.52.2.

ἐάλων (present: ἁλίσκομαι) "be caught": 5.59.5 καὶ πολὺ ἂν δικαιότερον <u>ἁλοίης</u> σὺ φόνου... ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμοὶ προσηκόντων, "And it would be more just for you to be apprehended... by my relatives,".

εἶμι (διὰ τῆς βασάνου) "be passed, go (through the torture)": 5.35.3 ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς βασάνου <u>ἰὼν</u> ὑπ' ἐμοῦ (κατήγορος ἂν ἐγίγνετο) "The man, having been passed through the same torture by me, (would have become an accuser)". (Cf. also Schwyzer, 1950: 226, 2: 237).

ἐκλείπω (τὸν βίον) "have one's life cut short": 1.21.6 ὑφ' ὧν ἥκιστα ἐχρῆν τὸν βίον <u>ἐκλιπῶν</u>, "having had his life cut short by

those who should least have done it,".

Transitives: πάσχω "suffer, be treated badly": 5.74.7 δεινὰ ἂν ἔφη πάσχειν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ "he would have said that he was made to suffer terrible things by me".

φεύγω "stand in trial, be accused or tried": 5.48.11 Ὥστε πολλῷ ἂν δικαιότερον ὑμεῖς κρίνοισθε ἢ ἐγὼ νῦν φεύγω ὑφ' ὑμῶν. "So that it would be more just for you to be judged than for me to be now accused by you.". (φεύγω is normally transitive in this sense: 5.9.2 φόνου δίκην φεύγω "I am accused in a trial of murder" etc.). For further discussion of "passive transitive" see 11.1.

When the verb is accompanied by an agentive noun phrase introduced not by ὑπὸ but by παρά, the verb may be said to be a border case between the "real" passive and an "ablative" construction:

1.21.5 ὃς ἄξιος καὶ ἐλέου καὶ βοηθείας καὶ τιμωρίας παρ' ὑμῶν τυχεῖν, "who deserves to be credited by you with pity, help and vengeance,". See also 1.26.7, 1.27.6 (and 3γ9.10, not in the present corpus).

8.1.2 The agent.

8.1.2.1 With all aspectual stems except the perfect, the agent is expressed by ὑπὸ + genitive; in one case by a genitive alone: 5.87.9 ἀνάγκη δὲ τῆς δίκης νικᾶσθαι παρὰ τὸ ἀληθές, "One must be overcome by the sentence (= comply with it), rather than by the truth," (i.e. the decision of the jury is stronger than truth).

Only once do we find a perfect passive form with ὑπὸ + genitive: 5.35.6 τοῖς δὲ λόγοις τοῖς ἐψευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνου ὡς ἀληθέσιν οὖσιν (ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι). "(But I am perishing) because of the things falsified by him as if they were true.". (Here ὑπ' ἐκείνου may have been used to avoid repetition of the instrumental dative τοῖς λόγοις... which in turn refer to ἀπόλλυμαι.)

8.1.2.2 For the perfect aspect the agent is introduced by a dative: 1.17.4 ἐπειδὴ αὐτῷ ἐτέθυτο τὰ ἱερά, "After he had sacrificed the sacrifices,". (Also 5.52.4, 5.77.4 (bis); see

Schwyzer 1950: 150,2; Kühner-Gerth 1898: §378.11)[42].

8.1.3 The Instrument.

8.1.3.1 Various phrases may denote the instrument with which the action or state expressed by the verb has been brought about.
5.3.5 ἄπιστοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ἀληθέσιν "becoming untrustworthy by (the proof of) the truth". See also 5.21.6, 5.35.6-7.
5.5.6 διὰ ῥήματα ἀπολέσθαι "die by talking".
1.20.4 (εἰς νόσον ἐμπίπτει,) ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἀπώλετο "(is seized by an illness) of which he died". See also 1.22.6.
1.8.3 τὰ γὰρ γενόμενα ἐν τούτῳ ἀφανισθῆναι ᾤήθησαν. "They thought that what happened would be effaced by this.". (See also Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §425.10-13; Schwyzer 1950: 165f.)

The instrument is not a category limited to the passive model; it is to be found in the active verbal model too, which is thus, under certain conditions, hard to distinguish from the passive one; this is so because the active ending of a verb does not by itself decide its model (8.1.1.2, 8.7): 5.5.2 ἐάν τι τῇ γλώσσῃ ἁμάρτω, "Whenever I am failed by my tongue,". See also 5.5.5 (bis). Incidentally, this tie with the passive verbal model may make us prefer considering the instrumental an independent part of the active verbal clause, not as a complement inside the verbal phrase.

8.1.3.2 With the passive perfect the instrument and the agent are both in the dative, and there is no way to distinguish them (= a neutralization) except by the semantic contents of the noun-phrase in question: if it is animate, we may conveniently call it AGENT, if inanimate - INSTRUMENT. But this solution is but an approximation, for there might be found an example where an animate noun phrase serves as an instrument in the hands of another animate noun phrase.

---

[42] Normally (but cf. above 8.1.1.1) there is no agent designation other than the dative with the perfect. The dative is here an allotagm of the ὑπό + genitive etc. Thus saying that the dative has a different emotional value (Aerts, 1965: 10; Schwyzer, 1950: 149β) is structurally meaningless.

8.2 Dependences

When the subject consists of a nominal or pronominal phrase as sketched above (§8), there is a dependence of person and number between it and the personal ending of the verb, be it a passive or active ending. The dependence is a unilateral one, since a singular subject conditions a singular verbal ending, whereas the opposite is not true: plurals of neuter nouns or pronouns have also a singular verbal ending. (See below 8.4 for omission of this subject.)

8.3 Negation

The finite verb is negated by οὐ: 5.77.4 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι ὕστερον αὐτῷ ἡμάρτηται... οὐδ' ὅ τι οὐ πεποίηται. "There is nothing in which he later sinned... nor which he failed to do.".

8.4 Omissions

8.4.1 Subject.

Between the subject and the verbal personal ending there exists a relation of extraposition; thus only one of them is a part in the clause, the other one being a kind of repetition. The relevant model-part in this case is the nominal subject, for it is the one which determines the dependences. Only when this subject is not present does the personal ending itself become the relevant subject, taking the role of a model part: 5.59.5 καὶ πολὺ ἂν δικαιότερον ἁλοίης... ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμοὶ προσηκόντων, "And it would be much more just if you would be caught... by my relatives," etc.

8.4.2 Verb.

After a passive clause, the next clause may omit its verb, even if it should have been in a different person or number: 5.59.6 (... ἂν δικαιότερον ἁλοίης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμοὶ προσηκόντων,) ἢ ἐγὼ ὑπὸ

σοῦ. "(... it would have been more just for you to be caught by my relatives) than for me by you."

8.4.3 Agent or Instrument.
Actually, none of our examples, with whatever verbal aspect (perfect, aorist, present) has agent and instrument expressions side by side. This may mean omission of either agent or instrument; it may mean that these constitute really only one model-part, so that either the agent of the instrument can be expressed. (A check of Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §425.10-13 and of Schwyzer, 1949: 165f. seems to corroborate the one-category view: no coexistent agent and instrument examples were found there.)

8.4.4 Both agent and instrument; the fourth agent.
We have seen (8.1.1-2) that the passive model is not to be identified with a "passive" verbal ending. It is, among others, the agent or the instrument expression which makes the model what it is. What would indicate the passive character of the clause when these are absent? What would distinguish the passive model from an active model with an intransitive verb-phrase?

The question is not easy to answer. In fact, lack of the agent may be said to bring about partial neutralization of the present model with neighbouring ones. The decision would lie then in the syntactic-semantic analysis of each example. Semantically, what distinguishes a passive clause from an intransitive one is the number of participants involved, actually or virtually.

8.4.4.1 In 5.31.1 ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐβασανίσθη "the man was tortured", it is clear that except the subject ὁ ἀνὴρ there must be involved at least one participant, designating the means or the agent by which or by whom the torture was executed. This semantic information is based in the main on a paradigmatic fact, namely that ἐβασανίσθη has corresponding active-ending forms, e.g. ἐβασάνισα (*passim*) which may be found in the active verbal model as a transitive verb, i.e. having both subject and object. But paradigmatic relation is not enough: to it must be added a constant semantic connection between the passive and the active forms. For example, we find in 5.24.8 τἆλλα ἀνήγετο πλοῖα without an agent, but with a passive

ending verb. Paradigmatically, the corresponding active form does exist (even if outside of our corpus): 4γ7.5 τὸν νόμον... τὸν φόνον ἀνάγοντα "that the law... assigns the guilt of murder". Only by noting that ἀνάγομαι means "set out to sea" while ἀνάγω means "assign, attribute" can we conclude of the intransitive status of the passive ending form. Note again that the meaning "set out to sea" is not enough to proclaim these examples of ἀνάγομαι intransitive, for the meaning may be deceiving: the same verb with an agent construction would have to be translated "be dragged out to sea", or the like. (See also 5.25.2.) Only the agent decides.

8.4.4.2 The problem of identifying the passive model without its agent is harder in "medial"-ending forms such as ἀπόλλυμαι "die" which seems a natural intransitive. Only a check of other examples with this form reveals that it may be combined with an agent: 1.29.6 ὑφ' ὧν ἀπόλλυνται "by whom they are made to perish" (cf. also 1.25.8, 1.27.6, 1.28.7). This may make us decide that the verb is in the passive model even with no expressed agent, but a wiser decision is to interpret such examples as neutralizations of models 8 and 10.

8.4.4.3 The hardest problem is met with when one comes to classify examples with active ending forms. We saw above (8.1.1.2) that some such forms are recorded in passive clauses with agent expressions: ἀποθνῄσκω, φεύγω, ἑάλων (ἁλίσκομαι), πάσχω, εἶμι, ἐκλείπω. Occurrences of these verbs, as well as of other active-ending verbs, are liable to belong to the present model, with no agent expressed. Here, as with the passive-ending types, and indeed as with neutralization in general, it is meaning which alone may help us: we must revert to the question of how many participants may virtually take a role in the action denoted by the verb. Thus ἀποθνῄσκω seems to be always liable to be accompanied by an agent expression, as are ἑάλων and πάσχω; φεύγω joins these when it means "be sued", but not when it has to be translated "escape, avoid" (cf. 1.13.2 etc.).

8.4.4.4 We said above that a passive clause supposes the participation of an agent even when this is not expressed. But in

such a case, who is this unmentioned agent? As is well known, passive constructions in many languages are most frequent precisely without an agent expression, thus being able to leave unspecified the doer of the action. (See for English Jespersen, 1924: 167-8, and for other languages the Wackernagel reference cited there.)

On the other hand, in languages which have a fourth-person pronoun (English *one* or *they*, French *on*, German *man* etc.) it is possible to paraphrase passive clauses with no agent by active clauses with this fourth person pronoun as subject, because both do not supply any information about the "active subject" (this term is from Jespersen, 1924: 166f.). Jespersen translates *it is known* by Fr. *on sait* calling *on* "generic person" (1924: 167). In fact, as Jespersen hints, most passive examples in English may be paraphrased by *they* or *one* (which is less idiomatic) with an active verb: *The city is well supplied with water: They (one) supplied the city well with water; The murderer was caught yesterday: They (one) caught the murderer yesterday*, etc.

The situation of the agentless passive clause resembles therefore those discussed above §§5.3, 6.4.1, where a zero possessor etc. is equivalent to "someone", "one" or other "impersonal" (neuter, generic) expression which we called the FOURTH PERSON, i.e. no specific one and everyone at the same time.

Thus our former example, 5.31.1 ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐβασανίσθη (8.4.4.1) may be rendered "the man was tortured" or "they (one) tortured the man" with no change in meaning. We may conclude then that the passive clause may have the agent expressed in all three persons. With a zero expression, it is the fourth person which is meant.

Other passive-ending form examples with no expressed agent: σωθῆναι 1.8.2, 5.37.5, ἀπηγγέλθη 1.11.2, τελεῖσθαι 1.19.3, τροχισθεῖσα παρεδόθη 1.20.7, ἐπιβουλευόμενοι 1.29.2, ἐδέθην 5.17.1, 5.17.6, πεμφθῆναι 5.23.8, ζητούμενος 5.27.1, κατεποντώθη 5.28.2, 5.28.8, ἐξηυρέθη 5.28.3, 5.68.2, μεμαρτύρηται 5.31.2, ἐξετασθῆναι 5.37.1, ψευσθῆτε 5.46.4, ἀναγκασθείη 5.42.2, 5.58.3, 5.76.5, ἐπείσθην 5.62.9, ἀποδέδεικται 5.64.2, 5.81.2, γνωσθῆναι 5.67.6, κατέγνωστο 5.70.2.

In the following examples it is not easy to decide for a passive or for an intransitive active clause: 5.27.3, 5.45.3 ἐφάνη

"appeared" (in Antiphon φαίνομαι never with an agent); 5.26.5 ἠφανίσθη, 5.27.7 ἀφανισθέντα "disappeared" (in Antiphon never with an agent). These two verbs may well be considered intransitives, corresponding to factitive active-ending forms: φαίνω, ἀφανίζω (§10.3).

Active-ending examples of a passive clause-model with no expressed agent may be found in Cleef s.vv. the verbs cited above, 8.4.4.3.

8.5 Presentation Type

No palpable deviation from the assertive type was recorded. Slightly exclamative clauses: 1.22.7, 1.27.6, 5.63.5, 5.73.1, 5.74.7, 5.77.4.

8.6 Word Order

No word order pattern was discovered. The "free" word order seems to serve purposes of Given-New distribution.

8.7 Discussion

8.7.1 There is nothing like the passive clause to show the difference between a model-behaviour and a model-part-behaviour. In fact, PASSIVE has long had a double meaning: (a) a form of the verb which carries not an "active" ending, but a corresponding one; this form, when in opposition to an "active" form of the same verb, and when combined with an agent expression, (i.e. when in the passive model) MAY express a passive relation. We shall call this PASSIVE-ENDING FORM. (b) A clause model of the kind sketched above (§8), which expresses a passive relation, i.e. that the agent is ultimately responsible for the process or state denoted by the verb, even though the subject may share the responsibility. We shall call this PASSIVE MODEL.

The stoics had already perceived this; their definition of the passive is strictly syntactic. Steinthal, 1890: I, 299 cites Diogenes Laertius VII,64:

> καὶ τὰ μέν ἐστι τῶν κατηγορημάτων ὀρθά (activa), ἃ δ' ὕπτια (passiva), ἃ δ' οὐδέτερα (neutra)... ὕπτια δ' ἐστὶ τὰ συντασσόμενα τῷ παθητικῷ μορίῳ (dies ist wol die präposition ὑπό), οἷον ἀκούομαι, ὁρῶμαι.

The difference between model and ending type is made palpable through the following facts: (1) Passive-ending forms with no corresponding active-ending forms are mostly intransitive, sometimes transitive, i.e. are admissible in the active verbal model: "deponents"; cf. ἔρχομαι, αἰτιάομαι, ἡγοῦμαι, ἐνθυμέομαι, κεῖμαι, προκαλέομαι, προθυμέομαι; intransitive ὑπολείπεται 5.16.10 but transitive ὑπελείπου 5.16.3 (not necessarily middle endings: transitive προύθυμήθη 1.6.5 with passive ending). (2) Even passive-ending forms with a corresponding active-ending form are not always passive in function (= in model). They may be middle, either intransitive or transitive (mostly reflexive): intransitive ἀπόλλυμαι: transitive ἀπόλλυμι; transitive ποιοῦμαι: transitive ποιῶ (with πεποίημαι in the passive model). They may again be transitives corresponding to active-ending factitives: factitive μιμνήσκω ("remind"): transitive μιμνήσκομαι, μέμνημαι ("remember"). (3) The passive model admits active-ending forms[43]; these are intransitive like ἀποθνήσκω, ἐάλων (active-ending aorist of ἁλίσκομαι) or transitive (φεύγω, πάσχω etc.) for which see 11.1.

8.7.2

> "L'opposition d'une flexion active et d'une flexion passive n'avait originellement guère de place au parfait, s'il était normalement intransitif. Un certain nombre de parfaits anciens sont intransitifs, avec la conjugaison "active"... D'autres parfaits sont de flexion uniquement moyenne à date ancienne, la valeur d'état propre du parfait le rendant apte à jouer un

---

[43] The significance of the passive model as against morphological form finds an instructive parallel in Coptic grammar: there is no morphological passive at all; there is, however, a passive model, consisting of a third person plural transitive verb, accompanied by an agent expression introduced by a preposition. Thus "He was mocked by the wise men" is literally "They mocked him by the wise men" (Till, 1966: §326).

grand rôle au passif" (Chantraine, 1961: §210).

In fact, the majority of the few passive perfect (or pluperfect) forms recorded do not have an active counterpart in Antiphon: ἡμάρτηται, ηὕρηνται, μεμαρτύρηται, ἀποδέδεικται, κατέγνωτο, ἐτέθυτο. ἐξημαρτῆσθαι has an active participle ἐξημαρτηκότι; the passive εἴργαστο (5.52.4) has a transitive counterpart εἴργασμαι; only εἴρηται, πεποίηται are related to regular active forms in -κα). Another interesting trait is that they are all in the third person.

This state of affairs suggests that in Antiphontean Greek the perfect system had not yet reached full "voice" opposition. In other words, for at least some of the verbs the only available perfect tense was the medio-passive one. Further, the only way to mention the "active subject" of such a form is attaching a dative agent to it. The result is an ERGATIVE conjugation of the verb in the perfect: third person "passive"[44] verb with an ergative agent nominal. The only difference between this construction and the intransitive ergative model (§ 9) is transitivity, i.e. the number of participants in the verbal process or state: the intransitive ergative clause, having no subject, has only one participant. The present passive construction has two: subject and agent[45].

---

[44] "Passive" here refers to the ending. Sturcturally, no passive or active FUNCTION can be discovered in a form without voice OPPOSITIONS.

[45] 5.52.4 τί μοι... εἴργαστο, the only passive model example in this verb, is in opposition with a transitive perfect εἴργασμαι so that, in spite of what we have said, the passive model does not necessarily accompany perfect tenses. However, εἴργαστο is the only example of a pluperfect of this verb, so that it may be argued that no transitive model was available for building a pluperfect, the only way was the passive model in the "ergative" use just discussed. It is known that the active pluperfect has taken even longer to develop (Chantraine, 1961: 232).

THE INTRANSITIVE ERGATIVE CLAUSE

I	II
Perfect passive third person singular[46]	Personal pronoun in the dative

1.31.1 (bis) Ἐμοὶ (II) μὲν οὖν διήγηται (I) καὶ βεβοήθηται (I) τῷ τεθνεῶτι καὶ τῷ νόμῳ. "Well, I have told, and I have helped the victim and the law;"
5.55.3 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον οὐχ ηὗρον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ ζητοῦντες τὸ γραμματεῖδιον, ὕστερον δέ.) τότε μὲν γὰρ οὔπω οὕτως ἐμεμηχάνητο (I) αὐτοῖς (II). "(For first they did not find the note, searching in the boat, only later.) For at that time they had not yet contrived in this way."

A possible example, if we consider μηδὲν to be an adverbial negation, not a subject: 5.8.6 ἕνεκά γε τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐμοὶ (II) τε μηδὲν ἐξημαρτῆσθαι (I) εἰς τόδε τὸ πρᾶγμα. "for I trust that I have done no wrong whatsoever in this affair.". Note that ἐξαμαρτάνω, like ἁμαρτάνω, takes normally no object except μηδὲν,

---

[46] In certain included clauses this part is in the infinitive.

οὐδὲν or τι, which seem always adverbial: "not at all", " "somewhat". (Cf. e.g. οὐδὲν in 5.70.6 οὐδὲν αἴτιοι ὄντες "not at all responsible" etc. and above 6.1.3).

We have a similar situation in 5.77.4 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι ὕστερον αὐτῷ (II) ἡμάρτηται (I)... οὐδ᾽ ὅ τι οὐ πεποίηται (I) τῶν δεόντων, "He was not guilty of a single fault, of a single lapse from duty," (translation from Maidment, 1953). Here too ὅ τι does not seem to be a subject (at least not for ἡμάρτηται) but an adverbial. (See discussion in 6.7.4 above.)

9.1 The third person singular form is in all examples in the perfect tense; in all these forms the categories of person or number are not relevant, since their person-number ending is not commutable; they are therefore "impersonal" and "innumeral" and may be said to belong to a part of speech other than the VERB. Yet these forms can be expanded by some of the typical verb-expansions: nouns in the dative, adverbs, etc.

Actually, speaking of perfect PASSIVE voice is not quite right: διηγέομαι is normally a transitive deponent with no passive imaginable. Similarly, βοηθέω has no direct object in Antiphon, only dative, and is accordingly not liable to be put in the passive. Further, ἐξαμαρτάνω in Antiphon is either intransitive or takes just adverbial τι, μηδὲν as apparent "objects"; this verb too is not eligible for a regular passive. In fact, for each of these verbs in Antiphon there is only one "passive" example: the one cited above. A similar situation holds for ἁμαρτάνω too. It seems rather that the "perfect passive" form is not a regular transformation of the active form, but a morphological type specifically fit for the present model. For similar considerations concerning passive perfect forms in the passive model see above 8.7.2.

9.2 No dependences hold between the parts.

9.3 The finite form is negated by οὐ or its compounds (5.55.3 οὔπω). The infinitive has μὴ or its compounds (μηδὲν 5.8.6).

9.4 No omissions seem possible.

9.5 The only presentation type recorded was assertion.

9.6 No word order pattern was discovered.

9.7 The intransitive ergative clause resembles superficially the passive model (§8), but a closer inspection shows the different status of its "passive" forms (9.1) as well as its different build-up and function.

The function of the model is that of a regular intransitive verbal clause. It is different only in the way it fulfils this function: instead of the verbal form with its person-number ending, it expresses the verbal content in a third-person singular form, reserving the categories of person and number for a dative pronoun.

This construction reminds one of ergative clauses in Basque, Eskimo, Georgian (cf. Jespersen 1924: 166; Hockett 1958: 235; Lyons 1968: §8.2.3) or even more closely, in Modern Syriac or Armenian (Polotsky 1961:22; Benveniste 1960: 201ff.). It is true that in most of the "ergative" languages it is the transitive verbal clause which has a "subject" in the ergative case, whereas the intransitive verb has a "nominative subject". Yet the fact of a "subject" (= person and number expression) in a case other than the nominative (here dative) is found in the present model too, although intransitive, so that the term ERGATIVE is not unbecoming. In fact, only an intransitive clause could be considered in Greek an ergative construction, as here there is only one participant, the person-and-number-carrying agent in the dative; any nominative noun, introducing another participant, would have been considered a "normal" subject, and the clause would have become either passive (1.17.4 αὐτῷ ἐτέθυτο τὰ ἱερά, cf. above 8.1.2.2) or possessive (1.14.3 ἦν αὐτῷ παλλακή, above 5.2).

In the literature very little is said about the present clause-model. Kühner-Gerth, 1898: 128, speaking about the dative agent, cite Hdt. 6.123 ὥς μοι πρότερον δεδήλωται. Schwyzer says that "Fast durchweg ohne Agens steht das unpersönliche Passiv", citing παιωνίζεται, παιὼν γίγνεται etc. (1950: 239,4). His examples are indeed impersonal, in two senses: (1) the verbal form has no relevant person or number; (2) the omission of the agent in the

dative makes it impersonal in the sense of our "fourth person".

Schwyzer has also two examples with an agentive dative: Aristoph. Thesm. 1227 ἀλλὰ πέπαισται μετρίως ὑμῖν; Thuk. IV 94.1 ὥσπερ καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται. Here the verb remains impersonal (and innumeral), but the clause does have a person, in the form of the dative pronoun.

ACTIVE VERBAL CLAUSE

The verbal clause-model is too complicated to be described in detail in this monograph. It is the only model treated seriously by grammars, no doubt because of its frequency in the texts, as well as because of the linguistic tradition of Europe ever since the first Greek grammarians. What made these grammarians disregard other clause-structures seems to be ancient logic, with its ὑποκείμενον (subjectum) and κατηγορούμενον (praedicatum), later ὄνομα and ῥῆμα (Steinthal, 1890: I 197,202, 205ff., 238ff.). These philosophical, later semi-linguistic notions were first grafted on the frequent verbal model (ὁ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζει), then on the copula model (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθός ἐστιν) practically leaving aside other possibilities.

The ample treatment given to the verbal clause since antiquity does not mean its description is satisfactory. In the following we shall confine ourselves to a few critical remarks.

10.1 The classical terms (grammatical) SUBJECT and PREDICATE, in use with most linguists, seem, after a short consideration, to be superfluous: granted the model consists of a noun phrase + a verbal phrase, and that the noun phrase is the subject, the verbal phrase being the predicate -- one can see no point at all in the

double terminology. Either subject-predicate or noun-verb should be dispensed with.

What does seem useful, however, is the division into Given and New, called by some (PSYCHO)LOGICAL SUBJECT and PREDICATE, because this bipartition is independent of the noun-verb division.

10.2 A neglected problem is that of the definiteness of the noun-phrase. We have seen above (§§3, 4, 5.1, 6) that certain parts of the models tend to be either constantly definite or *vice versa*. In the verbal model, noun phrases are definite or, better, do not have zero definiteness, in the overwhelming majority of examples (of course, for a valid analysis of this kind DEFINITENESS will have to be redefined, to cover e.g. τις, πολύς, πᾶς etc.)[47]. Yet indefinite (zero article) noun phrases do occur:
5.69.2 ἐντὸς οὐ πολλοῦ χρόνου παῖς ἐζήτησεν... τὸν δεσπότην ἀποκτεῖναι, "not long ago a slave tried... to kill his master". It should be noted, however, that such sentences have a special introductory status in the narrative, paralleling that of a newspaper title, and may require a separate "syntax of titles", or perhaps need to be described as a distinct model (for Coptic evidence on that matter cf. note 31).

10.3 A difficult question is whether to conserve the traditional "binominal" noun-phrase + verb-phrase representation of the verbal model, where object and all complements belong in the verb phrase. There seems to be a good case for establishing at least two active verbal models, one instransitive, bipartite, containing noun + verb, the other transitive or tripartite, consisting of subject + verb + object. One advantage of this way is that the relation of the tripartite active model to the passive one could be made more immediate, as they contain the same parts (the same CO-OCCURRENCE). Second, intransitive or transitive behaviour is thus assigned to

---

[47] Gleason, 1961: 156f. hints at limitations upon article-commutation in English: "The pairs of contrasting sentences commonly advanced to illustrate the difference in meaning (*The man came*: *A man came*) are, for the most part, either artificial or cited out of context". See discussion in Barri, 1975: 3.2.2.

ACTIVE VERBAL CLAUSE

The verbal clause-model is too complicated to be described in detail in this monograph. It is the only model treated seriously by grammars, no doubt because of its frequency in the texts, as well as because of the linguistic tradition of Europe ever since the first Greek grammarians. What made these grammarians disregard other clause-structures seems to be ancient logic, with its ὑποκείμενον (subjectum) and κατηγορούμενον (praedicatum), later ὄνομα and ῥῆμα (Steinthal, 1890: I 197,202, 205ff., 238ff.). These philosophical, later semi-linguistic notions were first grafted on the frequent verbal model (ὁ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζει), then on the copula model (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθός ἐστιν) practically leaving aside other possibilities.

The ample treatment given to the verbal clause since antiquity does not mean its description is satisfactory. In the following we shall confine ourselves to a few critical remarks.

10.1 The classical terms (grammatical) SUBJECT and PREDICATE, in use with most linguists, seem, after a short consideration, to be superfluous: granted the model consists of a noun phrase + a verbal phrase, and that the noun phrase is the subject, the verbal phrase being the predicate -- one can see no point at all in the

double terminology. Either subject-predicate or noun-verb should be dispensed with.

What does seem useful, however, is the division into Given and New, called by some (PSYCHO)LOGICAL SUBJECT and PREDICATE, because this bipartition is independent of the noun-verb division.

10.2 A neglected problem is that of the definiteness of the noun-phrase. We have seen above (§§3, 4, 5.1, 6) that certain parts of the models tend to be either constantly definite or *vice versa*. In the verbal model, noun phrases are definite or, better, do not have zero definiteness, in the overwhelming majority of examples (of course, for a valid analysis of this kind DEFINITENESS will have to be redefined, to cover e.g. τις, πολύς, πᾶς etc.)[47]. Yet indefinite (zero article) noun phrases do occur:
5.69.2 ἐντὸς οὐ πολλοῦ χρόνου παῖς ἐζήτησεν... τὸν δεσπότην ἀποκτεῖναι, "not long ago a slave tried... to kill his master". It should be noted, however, that such sentences have a special introductory status in the narrative, paralleling that of a newspaper title, and may require a separate "syntax of titles", or perhaps need to be described as a distinct model (for Coptic evidence on that matter cf. note 31).

10.3 A difficult question is whether to conserve the traditional "binominal" noun-phrase + verb-phrase representation of the verbal model, where object and all complements belong in the verb phrase. There seems to be a good case for establishing at least two active verbal models, one instransitive, bipartite, containing noun + verb, the other transitive or tripartite, consisting of subject + verb + object. One advantage of this way is that the relation of the tripartite active model to the passive one could be made more immediate, as they contain the same parts (the same CO-OCCURRENCE). Second, intransitive or transitive behaviour is thus assigned to

---

[47] Gleason, 1961: 156f. hints at limitations upon article-commutation in English: "The pairs of contrasting sentences commonly advanced to illustrate the difference in meaning (*The man came*: *A man came*) are, for the most part, either artificial or cited out of context". See discussion in Barri, 1975: 3.2.2.

the model, not to the verb; this would go well with the existence, in Greek as in other languages, of "two-face verbs" which in the presence of an object "become" transitive.

A third possible active verbal model would be the factitive one, where the verb has a double object: 5.14.7 τὰ μὴ καλῶς ἔχοντα ἐκδιδάσκει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. "It teaches people what is wrong.". See 1.10.3, 5.13.8, 5.14.11 etc.

In leaving factitive character not to the verb but to the model, it would be thus easier to account for verbs which "become" factitives when confronted with a double object (Barri, 1971: 6.63). As factitives may also be classified clauses with two objects, one of them in the accusative, the other in the infinitive, e.g. 5.75.1 ἀναγκάζων ἐμὲ ἀπολογεῖσθαι "forcing me to defend myself", etc.

This proposed third verbal model would also stand in a direct relationship with a "transitive passive" model (below 11.1)[48].

---

[48] For the three verbal models cf. Tesnière's *verbes monovalents*, *bivalents*, *trivalents* (1959: 241ff.; 255ff.), Barri, 1971: 6.6. Hockett has only two: transitive and intransitive, (1958: 204), but the third is called for by his "transitive passive" (*John was given a book*) (1958: 205). As has been mentioned above, 0.1, Fillmore (1968: §3) has also opened the way for "multinomial" verbal models.

CLAUSE-MODELS IN THE SECOND DEGREE

In descriptions of languages such as Coptic or Turkish one finds allusions to an interesting phenomenon of "degrees": some morphs, pertaining e.g. to the category of verbal tense or mood etc., may appear attached to the verb-stem more than once. Thus a past-morph may figure once in the verb-form, making it a past-tense form in the first degree; the same morph may then be added once again, rendering the verb a past-tense form in the second degree, or "past within the past (*plusquampraeteritum*)". Such is the case of the Turkish past morph -(*i*)*di*: with *gel*- "come" it builds a first degree past *gel-di* "he came" and a second degree past *gel-di*-(*i*)*di* "he had come".

This "degree building" is not restricted to the -(*i*)*di* past, nor is it limited to repetitions of the same morph: almost every tense-mood characteristic can be repeated or joined with another characteristic, to yield a "mixed" second degree tense or mood. Thus we have *gel-di* "he came", *gel-se* "if he comes", then *gel-di-ise* or *gel-se-idi* "if he came", etc. In fact, a third degree is also possible: *gel-di-idi-ise* "if he had come" etc. Lewis (1967: 106ff.) calls the morphs *characteristics* and the resulting degree *compound tenses and moods*. He assembles all compounding possibilities in a very instructive three-dimensional table (1967:

136).

The same degree-relations had been described by H.J. Polotsky in two less well known languages: in Coptic and Egyptian, and in Modern Syriac. In his "Egyptian Tenses" (1965) Polotsky speaks of *basic forms* and *auxiliaries*, and the resulting degree he calls *compound verb forms*. In the earlier "The Coptic Conjugation System" (1960) and "Studies in Modern Syriac" (1961: 22) he speaks again of *basic tenses* or *simple tenses* but has a special term for the second or third degree morphs: *converters*: the resulting tenses he calls *compound tenses* or *satellites to the basic tenses*. His *satellites in the second degree* (1960: 400) or *temps surcomposés* (1961: 22) we would in fact call *third degree forms*.

11.1 Passive Clause with Direct Object

I would now like to present the notion of SECOND DEGREE into the description of clause-models. In my opinion, this is the only way to account for a passive clause with a transitive verb like 5.74.7 δεινὰ (object) ἂν ἔφη πάσχειν ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ. "he would have said he suffered (was treated) terrible things by me.".

The active transitive clause (§10) is here "converted" by the agent expression ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ (8.1.2) into a passive model with an object. One may also say the other way round: the passive clause (§8) is here "converted" by the addition of the object δεινὰ, into a transitive passive clause. In any formulation one chooses, the clause contains more than enough for any given model: either the agent or the object are elements of the second degree (Polotsky's *converters*).

Other πάσχω examples are 5.58.2 μὴ αὐτὸς παρ᾽ ἐκείνου τοῦτο (object) πάθοιμι "Lest I myself should suffer this by him", and, from outside our corpus, 3γ11.5 ἀνδσι᾽ ἂν πάθοιμεν ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν and Fragm.34 ἄττα νῦν πέπονθα ὑπὸ τούτου. For possible examples of φεύγω see discussion in 8.1.1.2.

Our present corpus does not supply us with examples for passive-ending verbs in a transitive passive clause, but a glance through Cleef (1895) has brought up 6.36.1 ἐπειδάν τις ἀπογραφῇ (passive

aorist) φόνου δίκην (object). "as soon as anyone has a charge of murder registered against him."

That the transitive passive is not strange to other Greek texts may be seen from I Thess. 2.4: δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (object). "We have been thought worthy by God to be entrusted with the Gospel". (Cf. also Gal. 2.7; I Tim. 1.11.) Nunn (1920: 41) who cites and translates this example, sees in it a transformation of ἐπίστευσε ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, so that the indirect object of the active clause becomes the subject of the passive one. This dative-nominative relationship may be found in other languages, e.g. English: *John was given a book* or *A book was given John* (Hockett, 1958: 205). However, the active clause does not have to contain a dative indirect object: passive ἀπογραφῇ in our example above is in opposition with transitive ἀπογράφομαι which takes accusative of the person, not dative.

Another large group of examples, which may be considered "transitive passive" is those with infinitive object: 5.21.2 ὑφ' οὗ ἠναγκάσθημεν κατασχεῖν (object) εἰς... τι χωρίον "by which we were forced to put in at... a place".

All the examples in this section may be treated as passive counterparts of the factitive active clause proposed above (10.3).

11.2 Passive Copula Clause

The notion of degree is equally necessary to understand the construction of a "passive copula clause" such as 5.48.9-10 καὶ μὴ ἄκριτον ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὸν ὑφ' ὑμῶν. "and that he should not have been put to death by you unjudged." We have here as a basic model a passive clause, ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὸν ὑφ' ὑμῶν, which is "converted" into a copula model by the addition of the predicative (§4) ἄκριτον. The example should therefore be considered a second degree model.

A similar example, even though without an agent, is ἐκλήθητε, in 1.23.7 τούτου γε ἕνεκα καὶ δικασταὶ ἐγένεσθε καὶ <u>ἐκλήθητε</u>, "It is for this that you became judges and were called <judges>" and 5.88.7-8 Φονέα δὲ τὸν μὴ αἴτιον <u>ψηφισθῆναι</u> "for an innocent man to

be found guilty of murder".

The passive copula clause seems a passive counterpart of the active transitive verbal clause with a nexus-object, i.e. an object which is itself formally constituted of a non-verbal clause (sometimes of a copula clause), e.g. 5.18.4 τοὺς τε φίλους (I) προθυμοτέρους (II) ἔχειν "and have my friends readier". (See also 5.9.7, 5.34.6, 5.36.3, etc.). Thus we may imagine an active counterpart for 5.48.9-10 (see above) καὶ μὴ ἄκριτον ἀποκτείνειν ὑμᾶς αὐτόν or the like.

11.3 Active Verbal Copula Clause

At a first glance, this clause type is formally identical with the simple copula clause. It contains a subject (I), a predicative adjective or noun in the nominative (II) and a verb (III): 1.20.5 ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ ἡμέτερος (I)... ἀπώλετο (III) εἰκοσταῖος (II) "But our father... died on the twentieth day".
5.13.2 ἄκοντά (II) με(I) ἀναγκάσας εἰσελθεῖν (III) "forcing me to go in unwilling".
However, clause-meaning is different from that of the copula clause: ἀπώλετο means "died" with or without the addition of the predicative; it does not lose its full semantic force and it does not seem to form with it the tight ensemble of copula + predicative. This is why we have chosen to describe it as a verbal clause put into a copular second degree by the addition of a predicative[49].

The phenomenon has been noticed in many languages, under different terminologies. Thus Seiler (1960: 37) analyses the Latin *ibat medius*, which he rightly translates in a manner reminding one of a copula clause: '"er ging (, er war dabei) der Mittlere"'. Seiler refers to the construction, with Schwyzer

---

[49] Transitive verbs with predicative adjectives are recorded in other languages: Modern Greek Αὐτὸς σιωπηλὸς τὴν κοίταζε "He looked at her silent." (Voutyras 1920; cited from Mirambel 1962: 102).

(1950: 618), as *prädikative Apposition*. The term seems unhappy, as APPOSITION is better confined to substantives, and to a relation w i t h i n the same clause-part. A better term is *Zustandsattribut* suggested by Sommer (1921: 5), whose examples show that the same verb can sometimes be put in a copula clause (er blieb gesund "he stayed well"), sometimes in a verbal one with a "clause-attribute" (er blieb gesund zurück "he stayed back, healthy"). In French one finds again the notion of apposition in *adjectif apposé*; but the more traditional *épithète détachée* is perhaps more appropriate.

What might stand behind the current feeling that "to die" or "to enter" do not constitute natural copulas could be the immediate constitutents set-up. This may be said to have the form [subject] + [predicative+copula] in copula clauses like 5.5.7 [τὸ... ῥῆμα]... [ἁμάρτημά ἐστι]. On the other hand the analysis of second degree copular clauses would be [subject + verb] + [predicative]: [ὁ... πατὴρ... ἀπώλετο] [εἰκοσταῖος]. Such an analysis is also justified by the feeling that ὁ πατὴρ ἀπώλετο forms a complete clause, εἰκοσταῖος being an additional complement, comparable to an adverb of time. One should note, however, that there are cases where our feeling of clause structure leads us to two possible analyses, e.g. 1.13.3 ᾔδεσαν... οἰκεῖον... τὸ κακὸν ἀναφανησόμενον should be presented either as [τὸ κακὸν] + [οἰκεῖον + ἀναφανησόμενον], i.e. a copula clause meaning "the misdeed will appear their own", or as [οἰκεῖον] + [τὸ κακὸν + ἀναφανησόμενον], meaning "the misdeed will appear, being their own". This last analysis takes the clause to be a verbal one with an added second degree predicative.

The possible ambiguity of the analysis, when not taken to mean the failure of ICs analysis in distinguishing between "real" copula clauses and "false" ones, points at least to an eventual NEUTRALIZATION of the two types.

Still, one should note that the nominal causing the second degree cannot be added to the simple copula clause. Trying to add another predicative, e.g. ὑστεραῖος "of the next day" (of the same adjective class as εἰκοσταῖος) to 5.23.4-5 we get *ἐπειδὴ ἀφανὴς ἦν ὁ ἀνὴρ ὑστεραῖος, which does not make sense. It is true that

ὑστεραῖ- can be added to such copula clauses, but only in an adverbial or prepositional construction. As a matter of fact, the attested clause in 5.23.4-5 is τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ, ἐπειδὴ ἀφανὴς ἦν ὁ ἀνήρ, "On the next day, since the man was missing,".

This mutual exclusion of the two predicatives shows their belonging to the same syntactic category, and by this proves the proximity between the simple, first-degree copula clause and the second-degree one.

What remains to be taken into account is the fact that second degree predicative adjectives like ἄκων, εἰκοσταῖος etc. stand in opposition to an eventual adverb (ἀκουσίως, ?εἰκοσταίως; see Kühner-Gerth, 1898: §405, 2c) Anm. 2,3). This formal opposition must carry a difference of sense: the adverb modifies the verb to which it is attached; the second degree predicative adjective adds information about both verb and subject, sometimes only about the latter.

11.4 Passive Clause (and Copula Clause) with Predicative Participle

Certain verbs of showing, proving or revealing are found in passive clauses which are put into the second degree by an additional element, not included in normal passive clauses (§8). This element is a participle making a kind of passive copula out of the passive-ending verb:

5.22.2 οὔτ' αὖ ἐγὼ... <u>φαίνομαι</u> τὸν πλοῦν <u>ποιησάμενος</u> "Nor again... am I shown to have made the trip". See also 5.29.6, 5.77.2.

5.21.7 Οὔτε γὰρ <u>πείσας</u> τὸν ἄνδρα οὐδαμοῦ <u>ἀπελέγχομαι</u>... ἀλλ' αὐτὸς καθ' αὐτὸν τὸν πλοῦν <u>πεποιημένος</u> "Neither am I proved anywhere to have persuaded the man.. but to have made the trip on my own". (Cf. Cleef, 1895: s.v. ἀποδείκνυμι for more examples).

The clause is different from the passive copula clause treated above (11.2) because its predicative is a participle, a part of speech not included among the possible predicatives of the copula clause (4, 4.1.2). In the present second degree construction, the participle conveys the action or state in which the subject was

shown, etc., and is an immediate counterpart of the accusative participial phrase serving as normal object to active verbs of showing, e.g. 5.61.6-7 ἀπέδειξεν ἀδικοῦντα αὐτὸν "he proved that he did wrong". That this kind of clause can contain an explicit agent is shown by 2δ10.6 (not in our immediate corpus) τά τε ἴχνη τοῦ φόνου οὐκ εἰς ἐμὲ φέροντα... ἀποδέδεικται ὑπ' αὐτῶν. "The traces of the murder.. have been shown by them to lead not to me."

11.4.1 Third degree.

It is interesting to see that the passive clause with participial "converter" (cf. §11) can be put in the THIRD DEGREE by inserting a copula clause φανερός ἐστι or the like, in the place of the passive verb:

5.23.2 καὶ ὁ μέν ἐστι φανερὸς ἐκβάς ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου καὶ οὐκ εἰσβάς πάλιν. "And he was seen to have disembarked from the boat and not having embarked again." (Cf. also 5.57.6).

5.82.8-9 πολλοὶ δὴ καταφανεῖς ἐγένοντο οὐχ ὅσιοι ὄντες, "many people have been discovered to be unhallowed,".

It is difficult to judge whether this "copular clause within a passive verb withing a copula clause" is not in some way suppletive to the "basic" passive verb. For example, φανερός ἐστι may well be the passive equivalent of ἀποφαίνω which does not have in Antiphon any passive form. As it stands, however, it is a copula clause and will be here described as such.

Another interesting trait of φανερός ἐστι, καταφανεῖς ἐγένοντο, etc. is their relation to normative statement clauses (§6) where their counterparts would have been φανερόν (ἐστι) αὐτὸν ἐκβῆναι or καταφανές (ἐστι) αὐτοὺς οὐχ ὁσίους εἶναι, with infinitives rather than participles.

11.5 Passive Clause (and Copula Clause) with an Infinitive Object

The present construction is not unlike the one discussed above (11.4): δοκῶ, as personal verb, is found combined with an

infinitive.

5.45.5 Ἦ δοκεῖ ἂν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος <u>δύνασθαι</u>... ἀναξῦσαι... "Does a man seem to you able... to smooth out...". (Other examples in Cleef, 1895 s.v. δοκῶ). This construction is known in the grammars to take place with ἔοικα, συμβαίνω, as well as with passive verbs of saying and feeling and is considered as a personal counterpart of the "impersonal passive" (Kühner-Gerth 1904: §477 a), b), c); Schwyzer 1950: 377, 5).

The infinitive seems to supply the expression of what is thought (δοκῶ) or said (λέγομαι etc.) or what seems (ἔοικα) about the subject, whereas the thinker or sayer is in the dative or remains unmentioned, as with other passive or "impersonal" ("fourth person") clauses. This construction is in itself a second degree, for it is nothing else than a variant of the "passive clause with direct object" (above 11.1): instead of *John was given a book* we have here *John was thought to be able*... etc.

Now the same transitive passive model is found with a copula clause instead of δοκεῖ etc. or a passive verb (Kühner-Gerth, 1904: §477 d)). This insertion "converts" again the clause and puts it into the THIRD DEGREE:

5.79.2 οὐ <u>δίκαιός ἐστιν</u> ὁ ἐμὸς πατὴρ ἰδίᾳ δίκην <u>διδόναι</u>. "It is not right for my father to be punished individually." (cp. δυνατός 5.63.7).

5.45.7 ἃ οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡμέραν τις οἷος τ' ἐγένετο... ἀφανίσαι. "Which no one, even in daytime, could have removed." (see also 5.81.1-2).

5.88.5 αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα... <u>περὶ πλείστου ἐστὶν</u> ὀρθῶς γιγνώσκεσθαι. "It is most important for these affairs to be rightly understood."

5.32.2-3 (ἐφ' οἷς ἂν τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τῆς βασάνου,) <u>πρὸς τούτων εἰσὶν</u> οἱ βασανιζόμενοι <u>λέγειν</u> ὅ τι ἂν ἐκείνοις μέλλωσι χαριεῖσθαι. "(Those who do most of the torturing,) it is under them that the tortured say whatever they can to gratify them."

Most of the predicatives in these copula clauses appear, in the neuter gender, as impersonal-innumeral forms of the normative statement clause (§6): δίκαιον, δυνατόν, οἷον τ' ἐστι and prepositional phrases like περὶ πλείστου or πρὸς τούτων. Therefore, as has been mentioned, this third-degree model is indeed related to the normative, "impersonal" clause. Schwyzer and Kühner-Gerth

present this as a penetration of the personal construction into the domain of the previously uniquely impersonal one. What is more difficult is to find out what is the nature of the opposition between the two.

11.6 Aspect Auxiliary Copula Clause

In 4.1.2.2 above we have touched upon aspect auxiliaries like τυγχάνω, παύω etc. followed by a participle bearing the main verbal idea, e.g. τυγχάνω πλέων "I happen to sail". This construction belongs to the verbal clause (§10), but has a second degree form, where the finite auxiliary has the form of a copula clause: 5.29.1 ἐγὼ μὲν <u>φροῦδος ἦν</u> πλέων "I was on my way sailing". See also Kühner-Gerth 1904: §482, 15.

11.7 Non-Verbal Passive Clause

The non-verbal clause described above (§3) offers two examples of an agent "converter" which put the clause into a second degree by characterizing its passive-ending participle as a passive syntactically:
1.19.5 ἡ δὲ παλλακὴ... μᾶλλον φιλησομένη <u>ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλόνεω</u> "And the mistress... <is> going to be better loved by Philoneos".
1.27.6 καὶ αὐτὴ <u>ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ δικαίου</u> ἀπολομένη, "She too will be put to death by you and by justice,".

11.8 Transformations

The writer of these lines is conscious of the fact that at least some of his readers will try to identify his "second degrees" with so called TRANSFORMATIONS. This may be a natural thing to do nowadays, but would be wrong here. First, so little has been done up to now by way of stating clause models in Greek, that our first task is only to describe what is recorded; transformations

might come later if one needs them.

Second, Transformations as currently used are of two sorts: (a) traditional or Harrisian ("naive transformations") which express resemblance of meaning between sentences and sentence-parts; (b) "technical" transformations introduced in Generative Grammar as a special kind of rules. In spite of appearances, "naive" transformations are very different from my "degrees": while the former are rules for passing from one construction to another which has nearly the same meaning, our second and third degrees are the ADDITION of syntactic "categories" which do change the meaning, the way *gel-di-ise* "if he came" is different from *gel-di* "he came" (above §11).

As for transformations as special generative rules, they were not used because my approach is not generative. (For this matter see also above, §0.1, end.) I am interested here in models and their linguistic values, that is, their systemic relations with other models in the overall system of clause-structure-possibilities. I seriously think static system is the only facet of language available for us to observe, and I made sure it is completely static by severely restricting my corpus. On the basis of the relations presented above any one interested could now imagine transformations. To my mind these are subjective, deus-ex-machina devices, which say nothing about the only thing which is interesting: the system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aerts, W.J.
1965 *Periphrastica.* An investigation into the use of εἶναι and ἔχειν as auxiliaries or pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer to the present day. (Diss. Amsterdam.) Amsterdam: Hakkert. 216 pp.

Bally, Ch.
1944 *Linguistique générale et linguistique francaise,* 2ème édition (repr. 1950). Berne: Francke. 440 pp.

Barri, N.
1971 *Essai de syntaxe structurale du dialecte néo-grec de Cappadoce.* Diss. Paris-Sorbonne, 453 pp. ronéotypées.
1975 "Nucleus and Satellite in Nominal Syntagmatics". *Linguistics* 157, August 1, 1975.

Benveniste, E.
1950 "La phrase nominale". *Bulletin de la Soc. de Lin. de Paris* 46, 19-35 = Benveniste 1966: 151-175.
1960 "'Etre' et 'avoir' dans leur fonctions linguistiques". *BSL* 55 = Benveniste 1966: 187-207.
1966 *Problèmes de linguistique générale.* Gallimard.

Björck, G.
1938-40 Ἦν διδάσκων. Skrifter av Kungl. Hum. Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala, 32.

Blass, Fr. - Thalheim, Th.
1914 *Antiphon. Orations et fragmenta* Editio stereotypa editionis primae, 1966. Stutgardiae: Teubner.

Bolinger, D.
ed., 1972 *Intonation.* Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Chantraine, P.
1961 *Morphologie historique du grec.* 2ème éd. Paris: Klincksieck.

Cleef, F.L. van
1895 *Index Antiphonteus.* Ithaca: Cornell University (Reprinted 1965. New-York: Johnson).

Dahl, Ö.
1969 *Topic and Comment: A Study in Russian and General Transformational Grammar.* Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. 53 pp.

Daneš, F.
1967 "Order of Elements and Sentence Intonation". *To Honour R. Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton, 499-512 = Bolinger, ed., 1972: 216-232.
De Groot, A.W.
1949 *Structurele Syntaxis*. The Hague: Servire.
Dotan, A.
1971 Review Article of Rosén, 1967a. *La Linguistique* 7.150-4.
Fillmore, Ch.J.
1968 "The Case for Case". *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by E. Bach and R.T. Harms. New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1-88.
Frei, H.
1968 "Noyau et satellite en morphologie". *Wortbildung, Syntax und Morphologie* (Festschrift H. Marchand). The Hague: Mouton, 65-66.
Fries, Ch.C.
1952 *The Structure of English*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Garvin, P.L.
1972 *On Linguistic Method*. Selected Papers, 2nd. ed. The Hague: Mouton.
Gernet, L.
1923 *Antiphon. Discours*. Texte et traduction. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Gildersleeve, B.L.
1903 *Problems in Greek Syntax*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
Gleason, H.A.
1961 *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. Rev. ed. New-York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Goodwin, W.W.
1894 *A Greek Grammar*. New Edition. London: Macmillan.
Halliday, M.A.K.
1967-68 "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 3.37-81, 199-244, 4.179-215.
Harris, Z.S.
1946 "From Morpheme to Utterance". *Language* 22. 161-83. Reprinted in Joos, 1957: 142-153.
Hjelmslev, L.
1948 "Le verbe et la phrase nominale". *Mélanges... offerts à J. Marouzeau* 253-281 = Hjelmslev 1959: 165-191.
1959 *Essais linguistiques* = *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* 12. Copenhague: Nordisk Sprog-og Kulturforlag. Reprinted 1970 by Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri.
1961 *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*, transl. by F.J. Whitfield. Revised English edition. Madison: The Univ. of Wisconsin Press (repr. 1963).
Hockett, Ch.F.
1958 *A Course in General Linguistics*, New-York: MacMillan.
Jellinek, M.H.
1913-14 *Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Grammatik* 2 Bde. Heidelberg: Winter.
Jespersen, O.
1909-1949 *A Modern English Grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 7 vols.
1924 *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Joos, M., ed.
1957 *Readings in Linguistics*. Washington: American Council of Learned Societies.
Kühner-Gerth
1898-1904 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, v.R. Kühner - B. Gerth. Zweiter Teil: Stazlehre, Band 1 - 1898. Band 2 - 1904.
Lewis, G.L.
1967 *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., Jones, H.S.,
1940 *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New (Ninth) Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Lyons, J.
1968 *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: University Press.
Maidment, K.J.
1953 *Minor Attic Orators* I (Antiphon, Andocides). London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
Martinet, A.
1962 *A Functional View of Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
1967 *Eléments de linguistique générale*. Paris: A. Colin.
Meillet, A.
1906-08 "La phrase nominale en indo-européen". *Mémoires de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris* XIV, 1-26.
Mirambel, A.
1962 *Anthologie de la prose néo-hellénique*, 2ème édition. Paris: Klincksieck.
Morgan, J.L.
1972 "Some Aspects of Relative Clauses in English and Albanian". *The Chicago Which Hunt*, Papers from the Relative Clause Festival, April, 13, 1972, ed. P.M. Peranteau, J.N. Levi, G.C. Phares. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Newton, B.
1972 *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect:* A Study of Modern Greek Phonology. Cambridge University Press, XII, 236 pp.
Nunn, H.P.V.
1920 *A Short Syntax of the New Testament*. Cambridge.
Polotsky, H.J.
1960 "The Coptic Conjugation System", *Orientalia* 29, 392-422 = Polotsky, 1971: 238-268.
1961 "Studies in Modern Syriac". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 6.1-32 $ Polotsky, 1971: 585-616.
1962 "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen". *Orientalia* 31, 413-430 = Polotsky 1971: 418-435.
1965 "Egyptian Tenses". *The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, vol. II, No. 5 = Polotsky, 1971: 71-96.
1971 *Collected Papers*. Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University.
Robins, R.H.
1966 "The Development of the Word Class System of the European Grammatical Tradition", *Foundations of Language* 2, 3-19.
1971 *General Linguistics, An Introductory Survey*. Second Edition. London: Longman.

Rosén, H.B.
1957 "Die "zweiten" Tempora des Griechischen. Zum Prädikatsausdruck bein griechischen Verbum". *Museum Helveticum* 14, 133-154.
1962 *Eine Laut-und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform.* Heidelberg: Winter.
1965 "Quelques phénomènes d'absence et de présence de l'accord dans la structure de la phrase en hébreu", *GLECS* X; 78-84.
1967a *Ivrit Tova* [in Hebrew]. Second, revised edition with an Appendix on Clause-Models. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher.
1967b Ἦν διδάσκων et questions apparentées. Mises au point sur les contacts linguistiques néotestamentaires". Exposé à la séance du 21 mai 1966 de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, *Bulletin de la Soc. de Ling.* 62, XXI-XXVI.
1975 *Contemporary Hebrew.* Mouton: The Hague, 174 pp. (JL series critica 15).
Schulze, W.
1919 "Sprachwissenschaft", *Vom Altertum zur Gegenwart.* Leipzig [1]1919: 138-147; [2]1921: 124-133, Reprinted in Schulze 1933: *Kleine Schriften*[1], [2](no date), 1-7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
Schwyzer, E.
1950 *Griechische Grammatik,* Zweiter Band: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik, vervolständigt u. herausgegeben v. A. Debrunner. München: Beck.
Seiler, H.
1960 *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition.* Wiesbaden. Harrassowitz.
Sommer, F.
1921 *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen.* Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner.
Steinthal, H.
1890 *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern.* 2. vermehrte Auflage. 2 Bände. Hildesheim: Olms.
Tesnière, L.
1959 *Eléments de syntaxe structurale.* Paris: Klincksieck. 670 pp.
Till, W.
1966 *Koptische Grammatik*[3]. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
Wackernagel, J.
1892 "Uber ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1.333-436. Repr. *Kleine Schriften* 1.1-104.

INDEX TO THE EXAMPLES

place	*page*
1.1.1	21, 24, 27.
1.2	78.
1.5	70.
2.4	31, 34, 44.
2.5	34, 44.
2.6	31, 34.
3.1	18, 30.
3.4	38.
3.9	31, 34.
4.1	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26,27.
4.1-2	31.
4.2	32.
4.3	31, 34.
4.4	32, 34.
5.2	30, 34.
5.3	31.
5.4	69f.
6.2	67, 69.
6.3	19, 74.
6.3-4	70f.
6.5	74, 90.
6.6	69
6.8	30, 45.
7.5	67,75.
7.6	18, 74, 79.
8.	11.
8.2	72f., 88.
8.3	30, 44, 84.
8.5	47.
9.6	41, 45.
10.3	98.
1.10.6	67.
10.7	32,34.
10.9	32.
11.2	88.
11.3	59ff.
11.6	31, 32, 34, 35, 40, 43f.
11.8	69f.
11.9	32.
12.3	32, 45.
12.4	58, 61.
12.5-6	31, 69f.
12.6	72.
12.7	32, 34.
13.1	21, 73.
13.2	87.
13.3	30, 32, 33, 34, 103.
13.5	17.
13.7	21, 22, 24, 27.
14.1	50, 56, 62.
14.3	58, 94.
15.5	32.
15.7	32, 45.
16.2	59f.
16.4	32, 69ff., 72.
17.1	31.
17.2	74.
17.4	83, 94.
17.5	70.
17.6	69, 72.
18.1	43.
18.2	69.

place	*page*
1.18.3	74.
18.4	51.
19.3	88.
19.5	21, 107.
19.7	31, 37.
20.4	84.
20.5	102.
20.6	30.
20.7	32, 45, 88.
21.2	32, 34.
21.5	21, 24, 83.
21.6	82.
22.5	32, 43.
22.6	82, 84.
22.7	71, 82, 89.
23.7	34,101.
24.4	70.
24.5-6	32, 34.
25.1	69.
25.2	70, 75.
25.4	32, 34.
25.8	82, 87.
26.7	69f., 75, 83.
27.2	75.
27.6	21, 22, 26, 83, 87, 89, 107.
28.7	87.
29.2	32, 88.
29.3	30.
29.6	87.
31.1	92.
31.2	71.
31.3	71.
2δ10.6	39, 105.
3γ9.10	83.
11.5	100.

place	*page*
4γ7.5	87.
5.1.2	30, 34.
1.4	32.
3.2	31, 34.
3.4	31, 34.
3.5	84.
3.6	31, 33.
3.7	69.
4.4	69.
4.6	60f.
5.2	84.
5.5	69, 73, 84.
5.6	84.
5.6-7	44.
5.7	30, 33, 103.
5.8	30, 42.
6.1	69.
6.2	69ff., 73.
6.3	50.
6.5	69.
7.4	21, 22, 79.
7.4-5	23.
7.5	21, 24.
8.6	92f.
8.7	30.
9.1	32, 34.
9.2	83.
9.3	32, 41.
9.4	32, 34, 44.
9.7	102.
10.1	33.
10.2	17, 41.
11.6	30, 34.
12.8	32, 34.
13.2	102.

place	*page*
5.13.3	77.
13.3-4	68f., 73.
13.6-7	32.
13.7	31, 33.
13.8	98.
14.3-4	72.
14.5	31, 43.
14.6	54.
14.7	79, 98.
14.8	73, 76f.
14.11	98.
15.3	34.
15.5	45.
15.5-6	32.
15.6	58, 61.
16.3	90.
16.4-5	39.
16.5	68.
16.8	50, 55f.
16.10	58f., 61, 90,
17.1	88.
17.4	73.
17.6	88.
17.7-8	32.
18.1-2	32, 34.
18.1-4	63.
18.4	102.
19.1	38.
19.6	71, 73.
20.4	37.
20.6	76.
21.1	21, 24, 25, 27.
21.2	101.
21.6	51, 82, 84.
21.7	38, 104.

place	*page*
5.21.7-8	32, 34, 55.
22.1-2	38.
22.2	104.
22.5	51.
22.6	51.
22.7	32.
22.7-8	42.
22.8	32, 34, 36, 45.
23.2	105.
23.4-5	103f.
23.5	32, 43f., 82.
23.6	72.
23.6-7	32.
23.8	32, 88.
24.3	32.
24.5	38.
24.6	58, 61.
24.8	86.
25.1	30, 33, 35, 53.
25.2	87.
25.2-3	44.
25.3	32.
25.5-6	30.
25.6	53.
26.5	89.
26.6	21.
26.7	51.
26.9-10	58, 60f.
27.1	88.
27.3	50, 52, 55f., 88.
27.7	89.
28.2	21, 22, 88.
28.3	32, 33, 36, 44, 88.
28.8	88.
29.1	107.

place	*page*
5.29.6	37f., 104.
30.3	63
30.4-5	31, 35, 40, 44.
31.1	86, 88.
31.2	88.
31.3	51.
31.4	72.
31.4-5	71.
32.1	21, 24.
32.2-3	30, 33, 106.
32.4	32, 36.
32.8	32, 56.
33.5	82.
34.2-3	37f.
34.6	102.
35.1	21.
35.1-2	78.
35.2-3	30, 34, 48.
35.3	82.
35.6	32, 83.
35.6-7	84.
36.3	102.
36.6	43.
36.6-7	31, 34.
37.1	88.
37.3	32, 33, 35, 47.
37.5	88.
37.6	58, 60.
37.7	32.
37.8-9	50f.
37.10	32, 34.
38.10	32.
39.4-5	82.
41.4-5	82.
42.2	88.
43.1	30, 33.

place	*page*
5.43.2	21, 23, 24, 27.
43.4	59.
44.2	36, 45.
44.2-3	82.
44.5	69.
45.3	50, 52, 55f., 88.
45.5	71, 106.
45.5-6	32.
45.6	32, 44.
45.7	31, 34, 106.
45.8	31, 33.
45.9	33, 43.
46.2-3	32.
46.4	88.
46.7	73.
46.8	32.
47.3	32.
47.5-6	50, 56.
47.7	71, 73, 77.
47.9	32, 34.
48.3	82.
48.6	68.
48.9	72.
48.9-10	101f.
48.11	83.
49.9	32.
50.1-2	69, 73f., 76.
50.4	71.
50.6	70f.
50.8-9	30.
51.4-5	32.
51.5	32.
51.5-6	30, 33, 44.
51.7	32, 34.
52.1	32, 33.
52.2	82.

place	*page*
5.52.4	82f., 91.
52.5	71.
53.5-6	73, 77.
53.6	69.
54.2	31.
54.4	32.
54.5	32.
54.6	42.
55.1	75.
55.3	92f.
56.3	71, 73f.
57.1-2	58, 60f.
57.5	32, 33, 35.
57.6	105.
57.7	58, 60f.
58.2	100.
58.3	88.
58.5	58, 60.
59.5	82, 85.
59.6	85.
60.1-2	63.
60.2	68.
60.5	58ff.
60.6	58, 60f.
60.7	58, 60f.
60.9	58.
61.1-2	41.
61.2	68.
61.8	32.
62.5	31, 33, 37.
62.8	32, 34.
62.9	88.
63.1	30.
63.2	32, 45.
63.2-3	42.
63.3	16.

place	*page*
5.63.4	58, 60.
63.5	89.
63.6-7	32.
63.7	106.
63.9	32.
64.1	32.
64.2	88.
64.3-4	32.
64.5-6	32.
64.6-7	32.
64.7	71.
65.1	33.
65.2-3	32.
65.5-6	69ff.
66.2-3	32.
66.3-4	74.
66.4	45.
66.4-5	32.
66.5-6	32.
66.6	77.
67.3-4	70, 73, 78f.
67.6	88.
67.11	71.
68.2	88.
68.3	30, 33.
68.4	30.
68.4-5	78f.
69.2	97.
69.5	31, 33.
69.8	50, 53, 62.
69.11	32, 34.
70.2	88.
70.4-5	38.
70.6	30, 39, 77, 93.
71.3	69, 71.
71.4	32.

place	*page*
5.71.6	32.
71.7-8	50, 55f.
72.2	50, 55f.
72.4	69, 72.
73.1	89.
73.1-2	32.
73.2-3	70.
73.4-5	30.
73.6	69, 74.
73.7-8	69, 71, 73f.
74.3	32.
74.4	42.
74.7	83, 89, 100.
75.1	98.
75.2	32.
76.2	51.
76.4	38.
76.5	88.
76.6-7	32.
76.7-8	71, 73.
76.8-9	70.
76.11	68.
77.2	38, 104.
77.3-4	50, 55f.
77.4	83, 85, 89, 93.
77.5	34, 82
77.5-6	32.
78.2-3	32.
78.4	32.
79.2	32, 106.
79.4	32, 34.
79.6	32, 34.
79.8	32, 34.
79.9	30.
79.10	21, 24, 27.

place	*page*
5.79.10-11	42.
79.11	21, 23, 24, 27.
80.4	69.
80.6	32, 39.
80.7	32.
81.1-2	31, 106.
81.2	88.
82.1	71.
82.8-9	31, 34, 43, 105.
82.9-10	51.
83.1-2	59.
83.4	50f., 56.
83.5	31.
84.1	19.
84.2-3	51, 53.
84.6-7	32.
84.7-8	31.
85.5	32.
85.6	58, 61.
85.7	21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 42, 51, 53.
86.1	17.
86.4	32, 44.
87.2	30.
87.3	69.
87.4	41, 45.
87.7	32.
87.8-9	69, 71.
87.9	83.
87.10	50f., 55f., 65.
88.1-3	36.
88.3	31.
88.4	47.
88.5	21, 22, 24, 42, 106.
88.6-7	30.

index to the examples

place	*page*
5.88.7-8	30, 33, 35, 101.
88.8	69.
89.1-2	70.
89.4	32, 36.
89.5	50, 56.
90.6	31, 34, 35, 40, 44.
90.7-8	73.
91.1	71.
91.2	34, 44, 70.
91.3	42.
91.4	71.
91.5-7	70.
91.7	69.
91.8	21, 22, 24.
91.10	78.
91.11	78.
91.11-12	72.
92.2-3	33.
92.4	31, 33, 42f., 45.
93.3	39.
93.7-8	32.
93.10	38.
94.1	40, 45.
94.2-3	30.
94.3	21, 22, 24, 27, 42.
94.4	69, 74.
94.5	21, 42.
94.5-6	50.
94.7	21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 42.
94.9-10	30, 40.
94.11	32, 34, 43.
95.1	69ff.
5.95.5-6	39, 43, 45.
96.4-5	58, 60f.
6.12.7	77, 79.
15.5	17.
36.1	100.
60.7	61.

GREEK INDEX

ἄ 58.
ἀγαθόν 69.
ἀδυνάτως ἔχει 70.
αἰτιάομαι 90.
ἁμαρτάνω 91f.
ἁμαρτία καὶ ἀσέβεια 69.
ἀναγκάζομαι 82.
ἀναγκαῖοι 21, 23, 24, 26.
ἀναγκαίως ἔχει 70.
ἀνάγκη 69.
ἀνάγομαι 86f.
ἀνάγω 87.
ἀναφαίνομαι 29, 34.
ἀνοσιώτερον 69.
ἀντίδικος 33, 47.
ἄξιον 69.
ἄπαρνος 33.
ἀπελέγχομαι 38.
ἀπιστέω 48.
ἄπιστος 48.
ἀπογράφομαι 100f.
ἀποδέδεικται 91.
ἀποθνῄσκω 82, 87, 90.
ἀπολείπομαι 29, 34.
ἀπόλλυμαι 82, 87, 90.
ἀπόλλυμι 90.
ἀπόρως ἔχει 79.
ἀποφαίνω 105.
αὐτός 51, 58f.
αὐτόχειρ 33.
ἀφανής 47.
ἀφανίζω 47, 89.
βέλτιον 69.
βοηθέω 93.
βοηθός 33.
βροντᾷ 75, 80.
γέρων 21.
γίγνομαι 29, 34, 46, 50f. 53, 56, 58, 82.
δεδειγμένον 69.
δεῖ 11, 17, 68, 76f. 79.
δεινόν 69.
δεινῶς ἔχει 79.
διά 81.
διαφέρει 68.
διηγέομαι 93.
δίκαιον 69, 106.
δικαιότερον 69.
δίχα 37.
δοκεῖ 68.
δοκῶ 106.
δυνατόν 106.
δύο 51.
ἑάλων (ἁλίσκομαι) 82, 87, 90.
ἐγγίγνεται 68.
ἐγγύς 37.
ἐγχωρεῖ 68, 76.
εἰ 29ff., 35, 40.
εἰκός 11, 33, 69, 76.
εἰκοσταῖος 103.
εἰμί 29, 34, 46, 50, 51, 53f., 58, 71.
εἶμι 82, 87.
εἴργασμαι, εἴργαστο 82, 91.

εἴρηται 91.
εἰς 37.
ἑκάς 37.
ἐκεῖνος 33.
ἐκλείπω 82, 87.
ἔλαττον 69.
ἐν 36f., 70f., 81.
ἐνδεής 47.
ἕνεκα 37.
ἐνδείκνυμαι 29, 34.
ἔνδον 29ff., 37.
ἐνθυμοῦμαι 90.
ἔνοχος 33.
ἐξ 37, 81.
ἐξαμαρτάνω 91ff.
ἐξαρκεῖ 68.
ἔξαρνος 33.
ἔξεστι 68, 76.
ἐξουσία 69.
ἔοικα 106.
ἐπί 37, 70f.
ἔρχομαι 90.
ἐστί 67, 69f., 74, 79.
ἔστι 68f.
ἔστι (μοι) 59, 62f.
ἐτέθυτο 91.
εὐρόπως ἔχει 70.
ἔχει 70.
ἔχω 62ff.
-έω 47.
ζητοῦμαι 82.
ἡγοῦμαι 90.
ηὕρηνται 91.
-ίζω 47.
ἴσον 69.
-κα 91.
καθέστηκα 11, 29, 34.
κακοδαίμων 21.
καλέομαι 29, 34, 101.
κάλλιστον 69.
καλῶς ἔχει 70, 76, 79.
κατά 37.
κατέγνωστο 91.
κατέστην 29, 34.
κεῖμαι, κεῖται 54, 56, 90.
κρείσσων 47.
μακρότερος λόγος 69.
μέγα 69.
μέγιστος 47.
μέλει 79.
μεμαρτύρηται 91.
μεταμέλει 79.
μή 55f., 73, 93.
μηδέν 39, 77, 92f.
μιμνήσκομαι, μέμνημαι 90.
μιμνήσκω 90.
καί 16.
ὅ 77.
οἷόν τε (ἐστί) 69, 76, 106.
οἴχομαι 38.
ὄνομα 8, 39.
ὄντα 58.
ὅπου 50.
ὅστις 29ff., 35, 40.
ὅτε 29ff., 35.
ὅτι 20, 67.
ὅ τι 50, 93.
οὐ 16, 40, 55f., 60f., 73, 79, 85, 93.
οὐδέ 40, 55f., 60f., 73, 85.
οὐδείς, οὐδέν, οὐδεμία 39f., 55, 56, 58ff., 93.
οὐκέτι 73.
οὖκουν 73, 79.

οὔπω 93.
οὔτε 55f., 60f.
οὗτος 20, 21, 25, 33, 58.
παρά 81, 83.
πᾶς 59.
πάσχω 83, 87, 90, 100.
παύομαι 38.
παύω 107.
πείθομαι 82.
πεποίημαι 80.
πεποίηται 82, 91.
περὶ πλείστου 106.
πιστεύω 48.
πιστός 47.
πλέον 69.
ποιοῦμαι 90.
ποιῶ 90.
πολλοί 29ff., 35, 40.
προθυμοῦμαι 90.
προκαλοῦμαι 90.
πρὸς 37.
προσήκει 68, 76.
πρὸς τούτων 106.
ῥᾷστον 69.
ῥῆμα 8.
συμβαίνω 106.
σύμπλους 33.
ταῦτα 29ff., 35f.
τιμωρέω 48.
τιμωρός 33, 48.
τί 39.
τις 29ff., 31, 35, 51f., 79, 81, 93.
τοι (=σοι?) 72.
τυγχάνω 38, 58, 107.
ὕει 75, 80.
ὑπάρχει 68.
ὑπάρχω 29, 35, 56, 58.
ὑπὸ 81, 83f.
ὑπολείπομαι 58, 90.
ὑστεραῖος 103f.
φαίνομαι 29, 35, 38f., 46, 50, 52f., 89.
φανερός 105.
φεύγω 83, 87, 90.
χαλεπόν 69.
χρεία 79.
χρή 68, 76.
χωρίς 37.
ψηφίζομαι 29, 35.
ὦ 16, 18, 19.
ὡς 36.

INDEX OF NAMES

Aerts 46f., 51.
Bally 19
Barri 18, 39, 97f.
Benveniste 11, 26, 27, 48, 59, 62, 94.
Björck 47.
Bloomfield 8, 9.
Chantraine 91.
Chomsky(an) 12, 13.
Cleef 17, 18.
Dahl 15.
Daneš 15, 53.
De Groot 16.
Dotan 14.
Fillmore 9, 98.
Frei 39.
Fries 10, 53.
Garvin 39.
Gildersleeve 25.
Gleason 97.
Goodwin 71, 47.
Halliday 15.
Harris 10, 16, 108.
Hjelmslev 11, 27, 28, 39.
Hockett 8, 9, 10, 11, 94, 98, 101.
Jellinek 8.
Jespersen 10, 82, 88, 94.
Karay 40.
Kühner-Gerth 7, 9, 26, 27, 37f., 42, 46, 53, 82, 84, 86, 94, 104, 106.
Lewis 99.
Lyons 8, 10, 82, 94.
Maidment 34.
Martinet 13.
Meillet 26, 27.
Mirambel 102.
Morgan 20.
Newton 13.
Nunn 101.
Polotsky 8, 40, 51, 94, 99.
Robins 8.
Rosén 14, 47, 53, 59, 65, 80.
Saussure 12.
Schulze 8.
Schwyzer 7, 16, 17, 19, 26, 27, 42, 76, 80, 82, 84, 86, 94, 102, 106.
Seiler 102.
Sommer 103.
Steinthal 8, 47, 90, 96.
Tesnière 16, 98.
Till 51, 53, 90.
Voutyras 102.
Wackernagel 43, 88.

GENERAL INDEX

"ablative" 83.
accusative 101.
accusative with participle 38, 104.
accusativus cum infinitivo 12, 71, 76, 98.
acting (active) subject 38, 88, 91.
active (ending) 9, 81ff., 84, 86f., 89f.
(active) verbal model 11, 36, 38, 46f., 51ff., 66, 72, 84, 86, 90, 96ff., 100ff., 107.
actual sentence bipartition 15.
cp. sentence bipartition.
adjectif apposé 103.
adjective 15, 20, 21, 23, 25, 29ff., 33, 37, 40, 43, 45, 47, 67, 69, 102, 104.
cp. articled adjective.
pronominal adjectives 33.
adverb, adverbial 37, 54, 69f., 79, 93, 103f.
negative adverb 77, 92.
agent, agentive 38, 81, 83f., 86ff., 91, 94f., 100f., 104, 107.
Albanian 20.
allotagm 12, 84.
Amerindian 10, 12.
animate, inanimate 84.
aorist 85, 90.
apposition 39, 41, 103.
Aristophanes 95.
article 53, 59.
articled adjective 7, 29ff.,
cp. adjective.
articled infinitive 20, 25, 29ff., 70f.
articled noun 20, 25, 29ff., 33, 58, 71.
articled participle 20, 25, 29ff., 35, 40, 45, 50f., 58, 71, 81.
aspect, aspectual 38, 52, 83, 85, 107.
assertion, assertive 15, 18, 24, 42f., 61, 74f., 79, 89, 94.
atmospherical model 76.
cp. impersonal.

Attic 13, 54.
"attraction" 45, 56, 61.
attribute 61.
auxiliary 38, 107.
Basque 94.
bilateral dependence 39f.
binary 15.
binominal 9, 11, 97.
call-outs 7.
case 23, 51, 58, 72, 81.
clause 7, 8, 13, 15.
finite clause 12, 20.
primary clause 8.
subordinate clause 8.
commutation, commute 11, 14, 22, 52, 59, 93.
cp. substitution.
complement 36, 45, 84, 97, 103.
complementary distribution 63.
condition 41.
conditioning 51, 59.
connective, connector 55f., 69.
contamination 63.
context, contextual 42ff., 60.
contrast 61.
converter, convert 100ff.
Coptic 10, 51, 53, 90, 97, 99f.
copula (clause) model 11, 12, 24, 35ff., 52, 59, 70f., 76, 96, 102f., 104ff., 107.
copula verb 7, 29, 34, 39ff., 53, 102.
cp. verb, sentence.
corpus 12, 13, 14, 52, 76, 80, 108.
counterpart 101f., 105f.
cp. transformation.
dative 58f., 65f., 67, 71f., 73ff., 76f., 78ff., 81, 83f. 91ff., 101, 106.
definite(ness) 18, 20, 21, 25, 35, 51ff., 63, 65, 70, 97.
neutralized 59.
denominative 47.

dependence 15, 18, 23, 35, 39ff., 46f., 54f., 60, 72, 79, 85, 93.
cp. bilateral, unilateral.

deponent 90, 93.

derivational 47.

diachronic 12.

dialects 13.

"die" 103.

distributional 15.

Egyptian 100.

Einwortsätze 16, 17, 19.

ellipsis, elliptic 7, 12, 17.
cp. omission.

emphasis, emphatic 28.

ending (passive, active) 81ff., 85f.

ending (personal) 85, 93f.
cp. active (ending), passive (ending).

English 13, 15, 37, 53, 62, 65, 88, 101.

"enter" 103.

environment 51.

épithète détachée 103.

equational 9, 48.

ergative (transitive) 91.

ergative clause (intransitive) 54, 91, 92ff.

es gibt 53.

Eskimo 94.

état de langue 13.

Europe 96.

exclamation, exclamative 15, 18, 24, 43, 48, 55, 61, 74, 89.

exclusion 104.

exhaustion, exhaustive 13, 14, 28.

existence, existential, existing 36, 50ff., 58ff., 65.

extraposition 77, 85.

eyn 53

factitive 89f., 98, 101.

favourite type 9, 10.

form 11, 52, 86f., 89.
cp. *signifiant*.

French 9, 13, 53, 59, 65, 88.

gender 23, 40, 47.
Generative, generativist 8, 9, 10, 13, 108.
genitive 29ff., 81, 83.
Georgian 94.
German 13, 53, 65, 80, 88.
gerund 38.
Given 11, 15, 24, 25, 26, 28, 36, 40, 42, 48, 57, 75, 79, 89, 97.
cp. New.
Given-tense 47.
Graeco-Latin 9, 10.
Greek 11, 13, 14, 51ff., 65f., 76, 94, 96, 98, 101, 107.
Modern Greek 102.
"have" 62ff.
Hebrew 53.
Herodotus 26, 47, 94.
Homer 26.
idiolect 13.
IIF see impersonal-innumeral form.
il y a 53.
immediate constituents 9, 103.
imperative 7, 9, 43, 74.
impersonal, *Impersonalia* 7, 11, 50, 52ff., 58ff., 65f., 69, 72, 88, 106f.
cp. verb, passive.
impersonal-innumeral (form) 67ff., 78ff., 93, 106.
atmospherical impersonals 75.
cp. atmospherical model.
indefinite(ness) 18, 21, 22, 51f., 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 97.
indicative 40, 55, 60, 69.
indirect questions 43.
Indo-European 11, 40, 65.
infinitive (phrase) 12, 23, 40, 55, 67f., 70ff., 74, 76f., 101, 105.
cp. articled infinitive.
instrument 81, 84, 86.
interjections 9, 19.
interrogation, interrogative 15, 24, 43, 45, 55f., 69.
Intonation 8, 9, 10, 11.

intransitive (verbal) clause 9, 64, 94, 97.
intransitive ergative clause 54.
intransitive verb 36, 38, 53, 82, 86f., 90.
Latin 9, 59, 102.
lexical 47f.
logic 8,
man 88.
meaning 11, 87, 102.
cp. semantic.
Melanesian 10.
minor type 9.
model 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 48, 60, 62, 89, 107f.
model-part 11, 14, 37.
cp. part.
mood 52, 99.
negation, negated 15, 18, 23, 25, 40, 45, 55f., 60f., 73, 79, 85, 93.
neutralization 12, 15, 35, 51ff., 59, 84, 86f., 103.
New 11, 15, 24, 25, 26, 28, 36, 40, 42, 44f., 48, 55, 57, 75, 79, 89, 97.
Cp. Given.
polemic New 25, 44.
nexus 38f., 102.
nn̄ 53.
nomen 69f.
nominative 18, 20, 37, 39, 45, 50, 58f., 65, 69, 81, 94, 101f.
non-verbal (clause, part) 35, 42, 48, 69, 76, 102, 107.
normative statement 46, 54, 76ff., 79, 105f.
noun (phrase), nominal (phrase) 7, 9, 11, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 29ff., 33, 40, 43, 45, 48, 50ff., 58f., 65, 67, 71, 81, 85, 97, 102.
cp. articled noun.
number 23, 39f., 47, 52, 54, 59f., 68, 70, 72, 85, 93f.
numeral 52, 80.
object 15, 39, 72, 86, 93, 97, 100f., 105ff.
omission 15, 18, 23-4, 41-2, 55, 60f., 73f., 79, 85ff., 93.
cp. ellipsis.
on 88.
one 88.

ὄνομα 96.

opposition 12, 22, 51f., 91, 104.

oun̄ 53.

paradigm, paradigmatic 14, 15, 18, 22, 37, 39f., 48, 52, 65, 86f.

sub-paradigm 70.

part 14, 15, 20, 35, 37, 51, 59f., 68, 81, 85f., 89, 93, 103.
cp. model-part.

participant, participation 82, 86f., 91, 94.

participle, participial phrase 11, 12, 20, 23, 25, 33, 37ff., 48, 51, 53f., 60, 67ff., 71, 79, 81, 104f., 107.

cp. articled participle.

negated participles 41.

conjunct participle 38.

part of speech 11, 14, 22, 24, 33, 52, 59, 68, 93.
cp. word-classes.

passive (clause) model 9, 38f., 81ff., 89, 94, 97, 100f., 104f 107.

passive copula clause 101f.

passive copula verb 104f.

passive (ending) 38, 81ff., 85ff., 89f., 93, 100, 107.

impersonal passive 66, 106.

intransitive passive 9.

transitive passive 9, 83, 98, 100f., 106.

Paulus 101.

perfect 8, 83, 85, 90f., 92ff.

periphrastic 35.

person, personal 39, 47, 52, 59, 65f., 68, 70, 72f., 76f., 80, 93f., 106f.

fourth person 38, 65f., 71, 74, 77, 79, 88, 106.

generic person 88.

seventh person 65.

third person 50, 52f., 58, 67ff., 76, 79, 90, 92ff.

philosophical 8.

phrase
cp. noun, pronoun, verb.

Pindar 26.

pluperfect 91.

political 13.

position 11, 46, 48.

possess, possession, possessional 57f., 65, 94.

prädikative Apposition 103.

predicate 7, 8, 9, 96.
cp. psychological predication.

predication 46.

predicative 29ff., 33, 35ff., 39ff., 72, 101ff., 104ff.

prepositional phrase 20, 23, 25, 29ff., 36f., 71.

present 85.

presentation type 15, 24, 42, 55, 61, 74f., 89, 94.

presuppose 40.

progressive tense 47.

prominence 43.
cp. sentence stress.

pronoun, pronominal (phrase) 7, 15, 23, 25, 51, 60, 71, 85.

neutral pronoun 65.

personal pronoun 20, 21, 24, 29ff., 33, 35, 39f., 51, 58, 61, 67, 81, 92.

relative pronoun 20, 29ff., 81.

psychological predication 15, 97.
cp. Given, New, sentence bipartition.

question 18, 43.
cp. indirect question.

ῥῆμα 96.

rules 12, 108.

Satz 8.

second degree 39, 99ff.

semantic 86, 102.
cp. meaning.

Semitic 10.

sensation model 80.

sentence 8, 9, 10, 11.

cleft sentence 26.

copula sentences 7.

nominal sentences 26.

one-word sentences 7.

verbless sentences 7.

sentence bipartition 15.
cp. Given, New.

sentence stress 43.
cp. prominence.

signifiant 11, 46, 66.
cp. form.

signifié 46, 62, 66.

social idioms 13.

statal verb 36.

state-of-things clause 78ff.

Stoics 9, 90.

Structural(ist) 7, 8, 12, 52, 59.

subject 7, 8, 9, 15, 29ff., 33, 35f., 39ff., 51ff., 61, 70ff., 71, 76f., 79, 81f., 85f., 88f., 94, 96, 101ff., 104, 106.
cp. acting subject.

accusative subject 71f., 81.

subjective 108.

subjunctive 55.

substantive 60f., 103.

substantivize 51, 53, 79.

substitute, substitution 7, 11.
cp. commutation.

suppletive 47f.

synchronic 12.

Syriac (Modern) 100.

system, systemic 13, 108.

tense 52, 69, 99.
cp. progressive.

thematization 15.
cp. Given, New.

there appears 53.

"there is" (clause) model 36, 39, 42, 46f., 49ff., 59f., 62, 68f., 76, 79.

"there is to" model 49, 58ff.

there remains 53.

they 88.

third degree 99, 105.
cp. second degree.

Thucydides 95.

Traditional 7, 8, 10, 108.

transformation 12, 63, 93, 101, 107f.
cp. counterpart.

transitive clause 9, 64, 91, 97.
transitive verb 38, 62, 82f., 86, 90, 93, 100.
Turkish 99.
unilateral dependence 40, 55, 60, 85.
value 52, 108.
verb, verbal phrase 7ff., 11, 12, 52, 57, 59, 67f., 81, 93, 97, 102.
cp. phrase.
"compound" verb 38.
copula verb 8.
impersonal verb 8.
kopulaartige Verben 7, 42.
passive verb 105.
verbal phrase (group) 8, 38, 84, 97.
verbless sentences 7.
verboid 59f., 62, 73, 80.
verbs of feeling, saying 106.
verbs of showing etc. 104f.
vocative 9, 18.
voice 91.
word 11.
word-classes 7, 8.
cp. parts of speech.
word order 15, 18, 24, 43, 56, 61, 75, 89, 94.
free word order 75.
Xenophon 77.
yeś 53.
zero 65f., 73f., 77, 79f., 88, 97.
Zustandsattribut 103.